

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, July 25, 1994
Volume 30—Number 29
Pages 1485–1540

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

American Legion Girls Nation—1532
Apollo 11 Moon landing, 25th anniversary—
1530
Democratic campaign reception in Portland,
ME—1507
Dinner honoring Senator Robert Byrd—1494
Fundraiser for Texas Senatorial candidate
Richard Fisher—1525
Legislative agenda—1528
National Council of La Raza in Miami, FL—
1498
National Governors' Association in Boston,
MA—1511
Radio address—1492
Rwandan refugees—1535
Summit of the Americas Executive Committee
in Miami, FL—1496

Appointments and Nominations

U.S. District Court, judges—1492

Communications to Congress

Fisheries agreement and annex with
Lithuania, message transmitting—1507
Libya, message—1504
National Security Strategy Report, message
transmitting—1535
Trade with Bulgaria, message—1535

Communications to Federal Agencies

Assistance to the Caucasus, memorandum—
1524
Assistance to refugees of Palestine,
memorandum—1491
Assistance to refugees of Rwanda and
Burundi, memorandum—1496
Employee absence due to Tropical Storm
Alberto, memorandum—1492
Presidential Design Awards, memorandum—
1490

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
Boston, MA—1522
Briefing Room—1535
Cabinet Room—1528
Oval Office—1529
News conference, July 12 (No. 66) with
European Union leaders in Berlin,
Germany—1485

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

European Union leaders—1485
Panama, President-elect Balladares—1529

Notices

Continuation of the Iraqi emergency—1523

Proclamations

Captive Nations Week—1491
National Apollo Anniversary Observance—
1523

(Continued on the inside back cover.)

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Contents—Continued

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations

Attack on the Israeli-Argentine Mutual

Association in Buenos Aires—1504

5th anniversary of the arrest of Aung San Suu
Kyi—1525

Flood assistance to Georgia, Alabama, and
Florida—1507

National Security Strategy Report—1534

Statements by the President—Continued

Senate Judiciary Committee vote on Supreme

Court nominee Stephen Breyer—1525

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1540

Checklist of White House press releases—
1539

Digest of other White House
announcements—1538

Nominations submitted to the Senate—1538

Week Ending Friday, July 22, 1994

**The President's News Conference
With European Union Leaders in
Berlin, Germany**
July 12, 1994

President Kohl. Mr. President of the United States, Mr. President of the European Commission, ladies and gentlemen. First, I would like to welcome you all very cordially in the Reichstag building in Berlin. I am very happy, indeed, that the joint transatlantic dialog was conducted here in Berlin with the delegations of the two gentlemen I just welcomed.

This meeting, this dialog has taken place right after the G-7 meeting in Naples, the G-7 meetings which were attended by four member states of the European Union and the President of the European Commission. So, a number of issues we talked about today were, in fact, issues that had been touched upon in Naples already to raise the issue of Bosnia. In Naples we talked at length about the report of the contact group, and we did, at the time, publish a number of statements.

The transatlantic partnership, that is the close cooperation between the European Union and the United States of America, takes on special importance at a time in which Europe is undergoing radical change. And I think it's symbolic, indeed, that they're meeting today at the Reichstag and that we talked about this topic today at the Reichstag, a site within Germany where you just have to look out the window in order to realize that a few yards away from where we are, the division of Germany and Europe was reflected in the Wall, which is now gone. On this side of the Wall we always felt, by contrast, a special closeness between and among the Western democracies, a closeness, an affinity without which the Wall would never have come down.

At the end of the cold war, with the fall of the Wall, Central and Eastern Europeans now have a chance to determine their own

fate freely and openly. And that is why we shall call out to them from Berlin, saying that the European-transatlantic community is not a closed group. It depends on its effort and its sharing its free democratic ideas with all who want it. And therefore, closer cooperation with the countries with Eastern and Central Europe is a natural outgrowth of our talks today.

We resolved, therefore, to set up a working group which, by the time of the next transatlantic summit, which would be less than 10 months from now, this summit would be chaired by the French Presidency, which by that time would submit a draft containing coordinated procedures for the United States and the European Union in intensifying relations with the Central and Eastern European states.

All of us—and we talked about that today—must jointly remember that we make a great deal to be done, and we must ask ourselves what can we do in order to secure the free and democratic ways of the United States and the European Union and to protect them from the increasing stress emanating from organized crime and the drug mafia. We talked about that, too, today. And we talked about setting up a working group that will deal with these issues. And at the end of our meeting this morning we asked our staff to go right ahead and not only review the situation but submit important programs as soon as possible.

And in conclusion, I would like to say that we plan to further deepen and intensify the cooperation between the European Union member states and the United States of America. We want to do it in every possible way.

Yesterday I talked about the German-American relations, and I said something which I could repeat with a somewhat different emphasis.

For decades we talked about the transatlantic bridge ensuring our security. We

know today that we have to add a couple of components to that bridge. We have to add the components of economic cooperation, cooperation in the cultural area, and cooperation also in the area of bringing our young people closer together. And in that sense I think today's dialog has opened up a number of prospects for our future work, and we're going to act accordingly.

President Delors. Ladies and gentlemen, as the Chancellor has just said to you, this meeting which is taking place in the context of the Transatlantic Declaration has made it possible for us, I hope, at least, to inject a more practical and operational substance into relations between the United States and the European Union and this, of course, without creating any new bureaucracy.

Chancellor Kohl has indicated to you the two points on which there will be a joint followup: first, the development of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and, secondly, the fight against organized crime and drug trafficking.

Moreover, we shall pursue our dialog on economic matters which we began with President Clinton in January on the occasion of our last meeting. We shall continue this, thanks to the successful holding by the American authorities at the Detroit conference. We shall seek to fight against unemployment, making possible for everyone to have a worthwhile job in society so that there should also be a greater prosperity in what is an increasingly interdependent world. We have to work together, and we shall do this in the followup to the Naples summit by organizing in Brussels a new conference on the Detroit model, devoted to the information society—what we, the United States and Europe, can expect of this in terms of the creation of jobs, in terms of the consequences on the organization of work and on the very organization of society. And of course, in order to prepare for this, we will have to look at what we have to do in terms of education and life-long training, in terms of the organization of our towns and cities in particular, as well.

And finally, you know that Naples, at the request of President Clinton, the 7 decided to devote particular attention to Ukraine. An amount was even set at the request of President Clinton, an amount evaluated as being

what should be given in the form of aid. And today, we decided to monitor the situation together as a result of the Presidential elections so that on the basis of a joint examination we should be able to help this country get out of its serious economic, political, institutional, and social difficulty.

So you see that the Transatlantic Declaration has got to a new phase, a more operational phase, and one of more friendly and tighter relations.

Thank you.

President Clinton. Thank you very much, Chancellor Kohl and President Delors. Ladies and gentlemen, the United States strongly supports the European Union. Throughout my entire administration I have advocated the cause of the European Union. I believe our best partner, as we look toward the 21st century for prosperity and for peace, is a Europe united in democracy, in free markets, in common security. We have supported that, and we will continue to support it.

We agreed here today to try to do something that is potentially of real significance in terms of this developing partnership between the United States and the EU and that is to set up a group of experts who can put some framework, some meat on the bones of our declarations on two areas. And you've heard them mentioned already, but I want to reemphasize them.

The first is the need to strengthen our cooperation and coordination in our support for reform and democracy in Central and Eastern Europe. That is all the more important, I think, to all of us in view of the difficulties and challenges these nations are facing, and certainly it's been vividly impressed upon me on my recent trips to Latvia and to Poland.

The second thing that we agreed to do is to coordinate better our efforts in dealing with security issues and especially with organized crime, drug-trafficking, money-laundering. These things now know no national borders. The FBI Director from the United States, Mr. Freeh, just recently made what was a highly acclaimed trip, first to Berlin and then going on to Moscow. President Yeltsin was very intent on following this up when we met with him in Naples. We think this is one area that we can work together

on and really do something that will benefit the citizens of our nations, in Europe and in the United States.

Finally, let me just say that I want to particularly applaud President Delors for the white paper he issued on jobs and growth in the European Union that complemented and gave so much energy to the jobs conference we held in Detroit. We talked quite a bit today about how we can further develop our cooperation to generate more jobs and higher incomes.

And I will just close with this point. There are a lot of people who really believe that there is simply a limit to the ability of wealthy countries to generate jobs and incomes as we move toward the 21st century and there's so much more global economic competition. I do not believe that, not if we're committed to adapting our work forces, not if we're committing to expanding the barriers—I mean, tearing down the barriers to trade and expanding trade—and to the new technologies that will permit exponential growth, like the information superhighway and environmental technology. So we had a very good meeting; I'm very satisfied with it. I feel finally now we have not only recognized the fact of European Union and our cooperation but actually developed a system in which we can do things together that will make a difference to the ordinary citizens of our country.

German Armed Forces

Q. How do they feel about the decision just handed down by the German high court permitting German armed forces to participate in peacekeeping operations outside the country?

President Kohl. First, I'll have to ask you, understanding for the fact that I can't really assess the ruling because, after all, in Berlin here I don't know all the details involving the ruling. But I'm very happy about that ruling; there's no doubt about it, because it indicates very clearly that the highest German court, which is the guardian of our constitution, has determined that one of the missions would be in accordance with our constitutions. I've always argued that; my government has always argued that.

We were given an indication by the court that such a mission would require a simple majority in the Bundestag. That's not very surprising to me, either, because I cannot imagine how any head of government of the Federal Republic would initiate such a mission without having the appropriate majority in the Parliament.

So I think what was decided there is fully in accordance with the constitution and with the view of the federal government. What's going to come out of that in the future is something that we'll have to examine in each individual case on a case-by-case basis.

If you look at the history during this century, especially German history, you'll have to pay some attention to that. But we are members of the United Nations. And if we claim the rights that membership entails, we will have to live up to our responsibilities. I think it's unacceptable and not in line with the dignity of our country for us to stand aside and refuse to take on responsibility. So I'm happy about the ruling. But that's really not the main issue for the press conference.

One more question and then we will ask our guests.

Q. Mr. Chancellor, couldn't you say a little more about the criteria which the federal armed forces will base its missions on? France has requested that the Eurocorps might be sent to Africa. Is that something you have in mind? What would be the concrete repercussions as far as German foreign policy is concerned?

President Kohl. I've given a great deal of thought to this; I've thought in concrete terms. But please understand this is a very fundamental and important question, and I would prefer to talk with my colleagues in the cabinet about the ruling as a whole, and then we'll make a public statement. It makes no sense for you to keep on asking questions as to "What will you do if"; I won't say anything on that. There you go.

Haiti

Q. Then, Mr. President, may I ask you about what your administration has called a serious escalation in Haiti and whether you feel that this now moves us closer to a military option, whether this makes it much more difficult for international observers of any

kind to know what is really happening on the ground there.

President Clinton. Well, let me say, first of all, that what happened in Haiti yesterday puts in stark relief the human rights abuses that we have been talking about for some time now, the killing, the maiming, the rapes. Throwing the monitors out is just the latest expression of the desperation of that illegal regime and their desire to hide their conduct.

All I can say today is that I hope that this action will stiffen the will of the international community to support the United States in the strongest possible enforcement of the sanctions, including freezing the assets of the military and the elites supporting them. We have got to bring an end to this, and I think that, surely to goodness, the throwing out of the monitors will illustrate to the whole world that what we have been saying all along is true: This is not only an illegal but a highly oppressive regime, and we have to keep the pressure up.

Q. Mr. President, to follow, do you think that that will make it easier to make your case if it turns out that you do have to take the military route?

President Clinton. Well, I think it certainly validates the position I've taken so far, that that is an option we shouldn't rule out.

Q. Regarding Haiti, as you know, most of the generals at the Pentagon say it would not be a difficult operation to go in and overthrow the military regime there. What they're concerned about is an exit strategy, that the U.S. would not have to keep forces there for a prolonged period of time, that there would be other countries willing to participate in some sort of peacekeeping operation.

Do you have any assurances there are other countries that would be willing to go in after a U.S. invasion to help out, and did you get any assurances from the European allies?

President Clinton. Well, let me just say that there are two issues; there have always been two issues there. One is the one you have just outlined, which is that the last time the United States went to Haiti we stayed for, I think, 19 years. And that is a totally inappropriate thing to do in a world in which international organizations exist and, particu-

larly, a United Nations exists for the purpose of working with countries in trouble that need help.

Are there nations who have said that they would be a part of a United Nations mission? Yes, there are. But that leads you to the second question, which is that the United States has always—and we talked about this way back in May—the United States has always been basically moving back and forth between a Monroe Doctrine-type approach for 200 years, in the Caribbean and Latin America, and a good neighbor-type approach.

The people of Latin America, the people of the Caribbean obviously want us to cooperate with them; they want us to be friends and neighbors. They know we're the biggest country in the region. They want any kind of unilateral action by the United States to come only as a last resort. And they have reservations about it as you would expect they would. So Mr. Gray, one of the things that he has been doing so well is to try to consult with all of our partners and friends in the region and to try as far as we possibly can to, first of all, explore all alternatives and, secondly, have everyone going in lockstep and let everyone know what the United States intention and objective is. Our only objective is to restore democracy in Haiti and stop those poor people from being killed and tortured and raped and starved and basically deprived of the decency of an ordinary life.

German Leadership

Q. Mr. President, please permit me, a German journalist, to revisit a question that has to do with Germany taking on a greater role, taking more responsibility in the world. On that point, you are in agreement with Chancellor Kohl. Now, does the idea of German armed forces being involved in peacekeeping missions outside NATO, does that mean that you are totally comfortable with that? Aren't you the least bit uncomfortable thinking about that? And could it also mean that you could imagine German forces being involved in missions of the kind we had 2 years ago in the Gulf, for instance? Would that be all right?

President Clinton. I am completely comfortable with that. And of course, I can envision German forces being involved in some-

thing like the United Nations effort in the Gulf. Why? Because of the leadership of Germany, because of the conduct of Germany, because of the role Germany has played in developing the European Union, because of the values Germany has demonstrated in taking of hundreds of thousands of refugees from Bosnia. Germany, now united is—yes, it's the largest country in Europe in terms of population and its economic strength. But Germany has been the leader in pushing for the integration of Europe, for the sharing of power among the European nations, and for setting a standard for humane conduct and support for democracy and diversity. So, the answer to that question is, yes, I am comfortable with it.

President Kohl. One minute, I would like to add something, if I may. I feel a tendency here among you to somehow apply the constitutional court decision to the—[inaudible]. Since that is so, I would like to say that we will be deciding on the case-by-case basis with the majority in Parliament and that following the court's ruling, we are not feeling that the Germans are now rushing to the front. I'd like to say that emphatically, because I know my fellow citizens, some of my fellow citizens and I think it's therefore an important statement for me to make.

President Clinton. Maybe I could make one little statement about this. I think all of us want to play a constructive role where we can. But we have learned not only the potential but also the limits of military power in the 20th century. And the United Nations is trying to work through what can be done on a humanitarian basis, what can be done in the way of peacekeeping a mission, what conditions have to exist in countries in order for peacekeeping missions to succeed. So I think it is important that the German people, the American people, any others paying attention to this press conference, not believe that there is some cavalier eagerness to use military power in an undisciplined way which might cause a lot of problems.

President Kohl. Thank you.

North Korea

Q. Mr. President, I wanted to ask if you have any news for us today on the situation in North Korea, if anything has changed, and

whether you have any response to comments that have been made in the U.S. that there possibly is a sense by some in North Korea that the idea of progressing toward progress on communication with the outside world should be halted.

President Clinton. Well, we are watching it very closely. We are concerned about what might happen, obviously. My position on that is the same that it has been from the very beginning, that that is a decision for them to make and their future is in their hands.

But we believe it is in their interest and in our interest for them to continue to freeze the elements of their nuclear program and for us to resume the talks. We hope that is what they will do. In the meanwhile, we will monitor the facts in North Korea on the nuclear program. That is where we are. The next move basically is in their court.

Q. Do you have any feelings at all from anyone in the government at this point, sir?

President Clinton. No, only the communications we've had in Switzerland with regard to the talks. And those so far have been satisfactory and not out of the ordinary. So we basically have no indication one way or the other at this moment. So what we need to do is to simply be vigilant, to simply—to look at the facts. And it's not useful to speculate, I think, certainly not in a naive way that would be excessively hopeful but also not in an unduly negative way. Let's just look at the facts and judge this situation based on the facts as they develop.

NATO Expansion

Q. You agree then that relations with the Central Eastern European countries should be improved. Given that fact, do you think the timeline of Poland being a member by 2000 is realistic? Do you think that's a realistic prospect to hold out?

President Clinton. I'd like to make two points in response to that question. First of all, Chancellor Kohl and I have discussed this a bit and in our personal meetings. The NATO members themselves will have to get together and begin to discuss what the timeline ought to be and what the criteria for membership ought to be.

But the first and most important thing to do is to make a success of the Partnership

For Peace. The Partnership For Peace, I think it's fair to say, has succeeded already beyond the expectations of those of us who proposed it at the first of the year. We have 21 nations signed up, 19 from the republics of the former Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries; two, Sweden and Finland, that were previously neutral are not involved in NATO.

In order to sign up, all those countries agreed to respect each other's borders and agreed to cooperate militarily to preserve the integrity of those borders. We will have our first military exercises in Poland in September. So that's my first point. I think we have to strengthen the Partnership For Peace and discuss a timeline.

To the Poles I will say to you what I said to them directly: They have certainly shown the greatest interest in this issue, the greatest determination to do their full part, and I think have virtually assured that they are at the front of the line as NATO will be expanded, which it surely will be. We just have to get together and work out the details. It's not for me as the American President to say what the details should be.

President Clinton's Visit

Q. Mr. President, are you happy with the result of your visit to the Baltic countries? What do you think the next step should be there for that country getting rid of the Russian troops at long last?

President Clinton. Well, yes, I was very happy with my trip to the Baltic and with the meeting I had with all three Presidents. I am comfortable that in Latvia the Russian troops will be withdrawn by August 31st and that the controversy over the citizenship law there is being worked out, at least worked on.

In Estonia, I have passed along a message from President Meri to President Yeltsin. In Naples, we discussed it in considerable detail in our private meeting, and President Yeltsin promised that for the first time he would actually meet personally with President Meri and make a good faith effort to work this out. I still think that the troops could be able to be withdrawn from Estonia, as well, by the end of August if the last remaining disputes—there are three areas of disputes—could be resolved. And we will continue to

stay on top of that. We have agreed to work together on encouraging a resolution to that, and I think it can be done.

NOTE: The President's 66th news conference began at 11:15 a.m. in the East Hall at Reichstag where he met with Chancellor Helmut Kohl in his capacity as President, European Council, and Jacques Delors, President, European Commission. Chancellor Kohl spoke in German, and President Delors spoke in French, and their remarks were translated by an interpreter. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this news conference. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on the Presidential Design Awards

July 12, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Presidential Design Awards Program

As the largest purchaser of design services in the world, the Federal Government should be a leader in fostering design excellence. Good design can profoundly affect our lives by beautifying our surroundings, improving our productivity, and helping to effect social change.

Over two decades ago, the National Endowment for the Arts was asked by the White House to assist Federal agencies in improving the quality of design in the Federal Government. Over the years, the efforts of the Endowment's Federal Design Improvement Program have helped agencies to make significant progress in the pursuit of design excellence. I am committed to furthering those efforts.

The Presidential Design Awards Program was established in 1983 to honor successful achievement in Federal design and encourage excellence throughout the Federal Government. I recently announced the call for entries for Round Four of the Presidential Design Awards and asked Jane Alexander, Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, to implement the Presidential Design Awards Program. I am confident that she will have your full support. Please des-

ignate an individual with an appropriate background and position to serve as your liaison with the Endowment to ensure the success of this important program. Please be advised that there will be a Presidential Design Awards Program briefing at the National Endowment for the Arts on July 18, 1994.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on Assistance to Palestinian Refugees

July 14, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-33

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(2), I hereby designate Palestinian refugees in the Middle East as qualifying for assistance, and determine that such assistance will contribute to the foreign policy interests of the United States.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of funds under this authority, and to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:29 a.m., July 19, 1994]

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 15, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on July 20. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Proclamation 6706—Captive Nations Week, 1994

July 15, 1994

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

This year marks the 35th commemoration of "Captive Nations Week," our national expression of support for the people of the world who continue to suffer the yoke of oppressive governments. Freedom has made great strides in recent years, thanks to the quiet heroism of countless men and women. Yet far too many members of the human family still live in the shadows, shackled and intimidated in regimes of fear, and we must keep faith with them.

For over 200 years, this Nation has worked to realize the vision of freedom articulated by our founders, and before them by thinkers throughout the ages. Our commitment to the eternally-unfolding meaning and spirit of liberty expresses not only our most cherished values, but also our best hope for long-term international stability.

Freedom is a work in process. The people of the former Soviet bloc are making the arduous transition to free societies and free markets, and we will endeavor to support them as best we can. Less outwardly dramatic, but no less moving, are the democratic transitions that have taken place in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and there too, we will do what we can.

But great numbers of men and women are still not free. Authoritarianism still wields an iron grip over the lives of millions. And in this new time we are confronted by the alarming specter of racial, ethnic, and religious animosities and violence. It is thus all the more reason for us to recommit ourselves to the work of promoting respect for universal human rights and for political freedom for people of all races, creeds, and nationalities the world over.

The Congress, by Joint Resolution approved July 17, 1959 (73 Stat. 212), has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July of each year as "Captive Nations Week."

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim July 17 through July 23, 1994, as Captive Nations Week. I call upon the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and in so doing to rededicate ourselves to the principles of freedom and justice on which this Nation was founded and by which we will endure.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this fifteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:16 p.m., July 18, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on July 20. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Memorandum on Employee Absence Due to Tropical Storm Alberto

July 15, 1994

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Excused Absence for Employees Affected by the Flooding Caused by Tropical Storm Alberto

I am saddened by the devastating losses caused by the flooding that has resulted from tropical storm Alberto and the impact on the well-being and livelihood of our fellow Americans. Many parts of the Federal Government have been mobilized to respond to this disaster and to begin a massive effort to recover from the ravages of this flooding.

As part of this effort, I request heads of executive departments and agencies who have Federal civilian employees in the areas designated as disaster areas because of the flooding to use their discretion to excuse from duty, without charge to leave or loss of pay, any such employee who is faced with a personal emergency because of the flooding and who can be spared from his or her

usual responsibilities. This policy should also be applied to any employee who is needed for emergency law enforcement, relief, or clean-up efforts authorized by Federal, State, or local officials having jurisdiction.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Nomination of United States District Court Judges

July 15, 1994

The President today announced two nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court: Stanwood R. Duval, Jr., for the Eastern District of Louisiana and Catherine D. Perry for the Eastern District of Missouri.

"I am proud to nominate Stanwood Duval and Catherine Perry to the Federal bench," the President said. "I know they will serve with distinction."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

The President's Radio Address

July 16, 1994

Good morning. My radio address this weekend is being hosted by Philadelphia station KYW.

When I was running for President, I met Americans all over our country who were uncertain about their future, worried about a tough economy in which every new day made it harder and harder to make ends meet, worried about a sudden health care crisis that could drown them in a sea of debt, and most often, worried about the surging tide of crime and violence that has become a familiar threat in almost every neighborhood in our country.

We've made real progress toward renewing the American dream since I took office a year and a half ago, putting our economic house in order with \$255 billion in spending cuts, tax cuts for 15 million working families, an increase for the wealthiest 1.5 percent of

our citizens, all of it going to deficit reduction. Our deficit will go down 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. And we've got 3.8 million new jobs and record numbers of new businesses to show for it.

Expanded trade, real progress on health reform—we're moving in the right direction. But no matter how impressive these lists of accomplishments is, we will have failed to do our jobs if this year ends and Congress hasn't passed legislation to answer the urgent call of the American people to do something about crime and violence. For many millions of Americans, this is our number one concern. The random violence violates our values, our sense of family, our community, our whole hope for the future.

For 6 long years, the American people have waited while Congress and the President have debated on what to do about crime. The American people have asked for action, but all they've gotten is gridlock. As Americans have waited, children have been killed, terror has flourished. That waiting has to end and end now.

Both Chambers of Congress have now passed sweeping anticrime bills. Both versions will provide the most significant Federal attack on crime in the history of the United States. They include every major element of the crime fighting program I first called for when I was running for President: 100,000 more police officers on our street in community policing units; a ban on the most serious assault weapons that make our police officers often out-gunned by the gangs they face; a ban on ownership and possession of handguns by minors; a very tough penalty law, including a "Three strikes and you're out" law; and prevention programs to help give kids something to say yes to.

The crucial task before Congress now is to prevent few remaining differences in the House and the Senate bill from threatening the whole bill. Congress is close to finishing this bill. Hard work by Members of both parties has resolved all the major differences.

In the past, Congress has been stymied by an either-or debate over the false choice between tougher punishment or smarter prevention. One of the first things I noticed during the Presidential campaign was that every

place I went Americans, and police officers, especially, rejected that argument. Our citizens want criminals to be punished. They want young people, particularly in our poorest communities, also to have something to say yes to, to turn away from a life of crime.

The crime bill before Congress does both. It provides tough punishments for violent criminals, like "Three strikes and you're out", and it provides about \$8 billion to build prisons to ensure that violent criminals can be locked up. But it also provides about \$8 billion for effective prevention programs, like the youth employment and skills program that will give youth in high-crime areas a chance to learn skills on the job, midnight basketball programs, after school programs, summer jobs programs, things that our young people can do to avoid getting into trouble.

After passing the Brady bill last year, we also worked very hard to earn an impressive victory that guarantees the bill will include a ban on deadly assault weapons that don't belong on our streets or in our schoolyards. And perhaps most important of all, this crime bill will put 100,000 new police officers on the streets of America, walking the beat, getting to know the neighborhoods, providing a strong role model for local youth, the best protection, toughest enforcement, and smartest prevention you can find.

In Philadelphia today, I have nearly a dozen of Philadelphia's finest police officers. This city has an effective community policing program, but like all cities, they need more help to do the job right.

So don't let anybody fool you. This crime bill will make a real difference across our country in every neighborhood, every city, and every town. It will help to lower the crime rate. It's what the American people are waiting for.

Let me close with a terrible story about a little boy who understood why we can't wait any longer. James Darby, a 9-year old from New Orleans, wrote me on April 29th. "Dear Mr. Clinton," he said, "I want you to stop the killing in the city. I think somebody might kill me. I'm asking you nicely to stop it. I know you can do it." Just 9 days later, walking home from a Mother's Day picnic, James Darby, age 9, was shot in the head and killed.

I can't tell you that our crime bill would have saved James' life. But I can tell you with absolutely no doubt that it will save other lives and without it we have no hope of giving a new sense of purpose and safety to our people.

Like thousands of children across our country, James Darby was terrified of the violence ravaging his own neighborhood. He knew it wasn't right, he knew it shouldn't continue, and he knew it could endanger him. His letter to me was just the best way he knew to ask for help. Well, we can help. This crime bill will help. All the major elements of the bill have been endorsed by the United States Conference of Mayors, by every major law enforcement organization in the country, including the Law Enforcement Steering Committee, with over half a million police officers in its membership, and by countless local police chiefs, sheriffs, community leaders, elected officials.

Join them. Together, the American people will be a mighty coalition with a simple but essential demand: Congress, pass the crime bill and pass it now. Remember what James Darby wrote. I know you can do it.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 6:20 p.m. on July 15 at the Public Ledger Building in Philadelphia, PA, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 16.

Remarks at a Dinner Honoring Senator Robert Byrd

July 17, 1994

Thank you very much. Thank you. Senator and Mrs. Byrd, Senator Rockefeller, Congressmen Mollohan, Rahall and Wise and Governor Caperton and friends, I am glad to be here with all you folks from West Virginia, a small State with a lot of mountains. I identify with it.

I'm mostly glad to be here to speak for Senator Byrd tonight. You know, one of the first things I did on coming to Washington as President was to go by Senator Byrd's office and pay a visit. And on that visit, he gave me a copy of his "History of the Senate," which I actually proceeded to read, fearing he would one day give me an examination on it. [Laughter] Now, in this book, among

other things, he has a very moving autobiography in which he expresses his respect for Senator Richard Russell and for Senator John Stennis because of the advice and kindness that they gave to him. I feel the same way; I've learned a lot from Senator Byrd. He's always been unfailingly kind, and he's given me a lot of information I've needed and a lot of wise counsel.

Senator Byrd also expresses in this book his friendship for the late President Johnson, and he describes his relationship with President Johnson. And I can identify with that, too. There's a particularly moving part of this autobiography where he describes how he talked LBJ into appointing a Federal judge he didn't really want to appoint, but Senator Byrd did. And then he turned around and voted against President Johnson on the next major issue in the Senate. [Laughter]

I will say this, though, for all of his principles, Senator Byrd believes in our democratic system enough to advocate compromise on occasion. The other day I was trying to persuade him to change his position on the Space Station, from "against" to "for". And he said he couldn't do that, unless I were willing to move the Capitol to West Virginia. I'm still considering it. [Laughter]

It took me about 8 months here to at least be in a meeting with Senator Byrd and pretend not to be intimidated. [Laughter] That's different from not being intimidated. This is a town where, when people get a free moment, they go jogging, they play golf, they play tennis. He reads Thucydides. [Laughter]

On the Senate floor, he's the only person ever with the memory and the talent to discuss the line-item veto in the same breath with the conspiracy against Caesar—and with equal accuracy. [Laughter] And it works, you know, I've always been for the line-item veto, but when I realized I was in league with those guys who did Caesar in, I had to revise my position. [Laughter]

In all seriousness, now, I must tell you, I admire Robert Byrd. And based on my own family's history, I identify with him so much. You know, our two States, Arkansas and West Virginia, actually have a great deal in common. In the 1980 census, the counter said that our two States had the highest percentage of people living within our borders who

had been born there. That roots, that attachment to the land, the beauty of the land, the history of the land, even the toil, the poverty, the excruciating and backbreaking work, all of it creates a strength of character that is very much needed in this country today.

In an era where it's fashionable to bemoan the breakdown of the American family, Senator and Mrs. Byrd have been married for 57 years. That's something all the rest of us would like to emulate.

In an era in which the American people are so sensitive about their need to know things, to create the ability to compete in a global economy, that I was actually able to be elected President in part by pledging to create a system of lifetime learning, I realize what an example he set, getting his college degree when he was in his thirties, being the only sitting Member of Congress ever to earn a law degree while in the Congress, at a time when he already knew more about the law than 99 percent of the lawyers in the country. He is an example of lifetime learning. The rest of us will have to do as well.

Senator Byrd once said, "The achievement of difficult goals under adverse circumstances is still very much a part of the American dream." Well, I believe that, and I think all the rest of us do. And I want to thank Robert Byrd for helping us to achieve some difficult goals under adverse circumstances.

After years of talking about the danger of the Government's deficit to our children and grandchildren and years of recognizing we still needed to invest more in the education and training of our people, Senator Robert Byrd has helped us to provide 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President and still increase our investment in the education and training of the American work force. And it's a great tribute to his leadership that that has been possible.

I don't think anybody could acknowledge the importance of Senator Byrd to our Nation's life without seriously treating not just in a humoring way but seriously treating his voracious love of history and his devotion to its lessons. Cicero once spoke of "history: the evidence of time, the light of truth, the life of memory, the directness of life, the herald

of antiquity, committed to immortality." In the 20th century in the United States, no American leader has shown more reverence for history, no greater commitment to integrating its lessons, no greater reverence for the historical truth embodied in representative government than Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia.

His career was born in a time when mothers still dreamed that their children could grow up to be a Governor or a Senator or a President, when people were taught that citizenship was serious, that this was a wonderful country because, in part, we had a good system of Government capable of bringing out the best in people and solving our problems and seizing our opportunities. Senator Byrd's whole life is a testament to the idea that public discourse and public life can be things of very high honor.

Sometimes I think one of the greatest troubles of modern life is not the problems we have, for every age and time has its problems, not the fact that we have no absolutely perfect leaders—the Scriptures said that we'll never have any of them—but instead, the fact is that we seem so often to have lost faith in the institutions of our country and our capacity to solve our own problems. Sometimes we seem almost compulsive in our collective efforts to find the worst, even in the silver lining.

And I say to you tonight, Robert Byrd's life is a rebuke to that. It still ought to be that we would raise our sons and daughters to believe that not only citizenship but public life is an honorable and good thing and that if this weren't a pretty fine country, we wouldn't be around here after 214 years—218 years—otherwise I'd get corrected here. *[Laughter]* And I want you to think about that tonight, because too often today, I think, when the glass is half-full, we say it's half-empty. When somebody is giving 95 percent, we focus on the 5. And when other people look at us with envy, we talk about ourselves with great cynicism, as if all is lost when much is being won every day. If this were not a truly astonishing country, faithful to its roots, its principles, the dreams, and the institutions of its Founders, Robert Byrd could not have become what he has.

There could be no better tribute in this time, on the dawn of the next century, to honor Robert Byrd than this endowment to help educate more Americans on the workings of democracy. I tell you tonight, my fellow citizens, this is not a luxury. Understanding our system, believing in it and being willing to sacrifice to work within it to make things better for the people of this country, that is a matter of our survival. We have not been around all this time because our people sat on the sidelines and complained. We have endured and triumphed because our people threw themselves into the breach in every age and time until the work was done.

No citizen of America in our time has done this with greater zeal, greater energy, greater constancy and greater conviction than Robert Byrd. For his long and distinguished service to our country, it is my honor to say a simple thank you, sir, we are in your debt.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:10 p.m. in the Independence Ballroom at the Grand Hyatt Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Gaston Caperton of West Virginia.

Memorandum on Assistance to Refugees of Rwanda and Burundi *July 17, 1994*

Presidential Determination No. 94-35

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Determination Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as Amended

Pursuant to Section 2(c)(1) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(1), I hereby determine that it is important to the national interest that up to \$19,000,000 be made available from the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund to meet the unexpected, urgent needs of refugees, returnees, and conflict victims from Rwanda and Burundi. These funds may be contributed to international, governmental, and non-governmental organizations as appropriate.

You are authorized and directed to inform the appropriate committees of the Congress of this determination and the obligation of

funds under this authority and to publish this memorandum in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:54 p.m., July 25, 1994]

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on July 18, and it will be published in the *Federal Register* on July 27.

Remarks to the Executive Committee of the Summit of the Americas in Miami, Florida *July 18, 1994*

Thank you so much. Senator Graham, Governor Chiles, Lt. Governor MacKay, all the members of the committees who have worked so hard to make this a success, I'm delighted to look out there and see so many friendly faces. I thank all the Members of Congress who are here, Congresswoman Meek and Congresswoman Brown. Congressman Deutsch and his wife and two children went jogging with me on the beach today—Congressman Diaz-Balart, Congressman Shaw. Congressman Fascell, we miss you in Washington. I am delighted to see so many of my friends from the Florida legislature and from State government and Mr. Hawkins and all the people from the county government and all the mayors who are here. I thank you all for working together and for working together across party lines, regional lines, governmental lines, to make this a great success.

When I ran for President, I was obsessed with the idea that we had to do something to bring our country together, to face the major challenges here at home and abroad that would be barriers to our people living up to their full potential as we move toward the 21st century. And it seemed to me then, it seems to me now even more strongly, that there are three or four things that we have to do. One of them is embodied in this great meeting.

First, we had to get our economic house in order, bring the deficit down, get the economy going again at home. That's happened. We're on the verge of passing a budget which will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for

the first time since Harry Truman was President and, by 1999, the smallest Federal Government since John Kennedy was President and has produced about 3.8 million new jobs. So that's the first step.

But the second thing we have to do is to train and educate our people for the 21st century. And we're working on that. Lifetime learning must become the law of the land.

The third and the fourth things we have to do, it seems to me, both relate to this summit but especially the third one: We have to find more partners. We have to expand the frontiers of trade and investment. That's what NAFTA was about; that's what the GATT agreement is about; that surely is what the Summit of the Americas is about.

Finally, we have to find ways to continue to grow in a world of limited resources, sustainable development. We have to find it through environmental technologies. We have to find it through the information superhighway that the Vice President talks about. We have to prove in other words that the skeptics, who believe that in the 21st century technology for the first time in all of human history will reduce total economic opportunities, are dead wrong.

And if you think about the Summit of the Americas and what it means not just to Miami and Dade County in Florida but to all of the United States as we move toward the 21st century, in that context you can see the historic importance of the endeavor in which you are engaged. We have got to find a way to capitalize on the fact that all but two nations in this hemisphere are now governed by democracy.

When we consulted with all of our friends and partners and all the other nations that will participate, there was a consensus that we ought to focus on three things: first of all, how to strengthen democracy in these nations. All of us know, as we argue and fight and struggle, that democracy, as Churchill once said, is the worst form of government in the world except for all the others. [*Laughter*] But it requires a lot of management. It's not an easy, clean, neat thing. And it requires a lot of infrastructure. So the first thing that our partners wanted us to discuss is how we can keep democracy alive in all these nations and how we can make it function better, what

kinds of systems do they need to develop in various countries to help that. The second thing, obviously, that everybody wanted to discuss was how we can continue to integrate the Americas economically, to expand the frontiers of trade and investment and to help all the nations to grow. The third thing that they all wanted to discuss was what now has become known as sustainable development; how can we preserve the environment and promote the economy? And interestingly enough, it is not just an issue for the developing nations; it is not just an issue for Amazonia. It's an issue for the United States and Canada as we struggle to preserve the salmon population in the Pacific Northwest and still make it possible for our people to make a living up there.

So these things will be the focus of this summit, the political focus, the economic focus, the sustainable development focus. And if we do it right, if we prepare well, if we organize well, if we listen to our friends well, and if then we have a real system for following up on this, this will not only be a phenomenal thing for all of you here in this region, but 20 or 30 years from now, people will look back on it as a truly historic event for the United States. I think some evidence of that is the importance we attach to it.

I want to thank two people in particular who are here today. First of all, Congressman Esteban Torres of California doesn't represent Dade County, but he showed up today because he supports what we're trying to do, and he is a very good man. And secondly, I would like to thank my Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Henry Cisneros, who has also come to Miami to make an important announcement later today.

The last thing I want to do is to say, if I might, a simple thank you, and go get 'em, because I am well aware that this conference cannot succeed without the kind of enthusiasm that you've already expressed here this morning being sustained between now and December.

I just, last night, had an interesting talk with the coach of the Brazilian soccer team. But one of the things he said that will leave a lasting impression on me, he said, in quite

good English—once again, impressed upon me that I couldn't speak Spanish very well, much less Portuguese—he said, “When we came to America, no one quite knew what to expect because your country was not supposed to be the home of soccer. But it's the best World Cup we ever had.”

Now, we are the home of democracy. We are the home of expanded trade. We are the country that, of all the great democracies of the world, has the most racial and ethnic and cultural and religious diversity. And we must make these nations feel that we are their true friend and partners and that we are going into the next century together, not just for our children but for theirs as well.

That is your mission. If you can do it, I will say again, 20 or 30 years from now, the entire United States, indeed, this entire part of the world, will look back on this event and thank you for setting us on the proper course to the future.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12 p.m. in the Cypress Room at the Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Gov. Lawton Chiles and Lt. Gov. Buddy MacKay of Florida, and Dade County Commissioner Larry Hawkins.

Remarks to the National Council of La Raza in Miami

July 18, 1994

Thank you so much, Secretary Cisneros, for that stirring set of remarks, for your kind and generous introduction, but more importantly, for your creative, vigorous, and effective leadership in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a Department that is now known as a source of innovation, well run, efficiently run, but also a place where values count, where ideas count, on the cutting edge of change. Henry Cisneros, whether he is trying to integrate a housing development in Vidor, Texas, or trying to give safety and security back to the children in the public housing in Chicago or donning a hard hat to try to take some buildings down and make public housing more humane all across the country, he's the model of what we all ought to be in public service today. Let me also say, only half jokingly, he also

has just demonstrated Clinton's third law of politics, which is whenever possible be introduced by someone you've appointed to high office; they will brag on you every time. [Laughter]

To President Raul Yzaguirre—we were just reminiscing that he has been a leader of La Raza now for 20 years. I'm very glad you don't have term limits. [Laughter] He's been a good thing for your organization. To your board chair, Audrey Alvarado; to all the Members of Congress who are here, Congressman Pastor and Congressman Esteban Torres, who came from Washington with me and represents California and all the Members of the Florida delegation who are here, Representatives Meek and Brown and Deutsch, Diaz-Balart, and Shaw; and to my good friend Senator Bob Graham and Lt. Governor MacKay—and I think Governor Chiles is here; I know he was here: I am delighted to be here in Florida and most especially with La Raza.

I want to say that when Henry and I were discussing what I should say today, he said I should say—let's see if I do it—*Si, se puede*. Yes, we can. That has been the model of my Presidency, and in some ways it was the model I was raised with by my wonderful mother who never spoke a word of Spanish but understood that message. I want to especially recognize, too, the honored guests you have here for Seniors Day. They know the meaning of those words, and they have done so much for us.

As we gather here today, looking into a future that will begin a new century and a new millennium, I think it is important that we view all the specifics that we discussed, those that you have already discussed and the things I am about to say, in the larger context of the challenges of this time. I asked the American people for this office because I believed that we had to do much more to restore our economy, to restore the American dream, to help to create a world of peace and prosperity in which Americans could live up to their full potential, because I believed that we could not do that unless we made a great strength of our diversity, unless we were a country coming together, not coming apart, and because I believed we could not

do that unless the Government of the United States worked for ordinary citizens again.

The future of the 21st century, the America that I want to see us build together, will be an America where Hispanic leadership anchors its place in boardrooms, schoolrooms, and all the halls of power, in which Hispanic-Americans will be sought out as leaders among opinion shapers and policymakers. In the America that's not just around the corner, in all our futures, Hispanics running for mayor, Governor, Congress, and yes, for President won't be running against the tide but with it. They will be leading the rebuilding of America and a renaissance of community, family, and work from the grassroots up.

Of course, much of this is happening already. More than 5,000 Hispanics hold elective office in America today, a world away from the numbers of a generation ago. The Hispanic Congressional Caucus has grown to 18 members and will surely grow more.

Up and down the Americas, as we nurture democracy and expand trade, Hispanics are the bridges between our different countries and our cultures, bridges that will lead us to tomorrow.

There is no doubt that in the unity of Hispanic-Americans there is great strength and that in the diversity of America there is great strength if we will but develop it and nourish it.

In the last 18 months since I took office, we have followed that course, a course set in a long campaign and before that in a long public life, a course of change that you deserved. One of the things I have tried to do, and Secretary Cisneros referred to that, is to try to make this administration look more like America.

Henry Cisneros and Federico Peña have become household names. But there are 288 other Hispanic-American appointees, 2.5 times as many as in the previous administration, many at the senior level. Eleven percent of the judicial appointments are Latinos, compared to just two appointments in each of the last two administrations. They are people who may or may not be well known, but they are making a difference every day, people like Aida Alvarez and Nelson Diaz at HUD; Norma Cantu and Mario Moreno at Education; Fernando Torres-Gil at HHS and

Jack Otero and Maria Echaveste at Labor; Joe Valasquez, Suzanna Valdez, Carolyn Curiel, and many others in the White House. I have recently nominated Gill Casellas to head the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. We've been joined by Polly Baca as Director of Consumer Affairs at the Department of Health and Human Services and by General Ed Baca as head of the National Guard, the first Hispanic ever to head the National Guard in the history of the United States.

If you ask me do we need to do more and better, I would say yes. But we are doing better than people have done before. You just keep urging and working, and we'll keep doing better, broadening the base of America's Government.

The whole purpose and strategy of everything that I have tried to do as your President is to make the American dream a real possibility for all of our citizens in a dramatic, even breathtakingly, changing world.

The first thing we had to do was to get our economic house in order, to end the drift of the economy. Last year, Congress voted by the narrowest of margins for the economic plan that I proposed that included \$255 billion in spending cuts, tax breaks for 15 million working American families, making 90 percent of our small businesses eligible for tax reductions, increasing income taxes on the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people.

When that budget, combined with this budget, which eliminates over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, and reduces the Federal work force by over a quarter of a million, giving us the smallest Federal Government in 1999 that we've had since Kennedy was President, when these two budgets are put together, we will have reduced the Federal deficit for 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States.

The Federal debt we will pass along to our children and grandchildren will be \$700 billion less than it was estimated to be when I took office as President. We're also trying to grow this economy through expanding exports, through trade agreements like NAFTA and GATT, bringing down foreign barriers to our products and services, eliminating our

own barriers to the exports of a lot of our high-tech products.

Already because of NAFTA, we're exporting autos to Mexico at more than 5 times the rate of a year ago. And overall exports to Mexico are growing faster than to any other country with which we trade. Mexico's exports to the United States are also up, too. Both of us are winning, because we did the right thing on NAFTA last year.

And I have just come from a meeting of distinguished citizens of south Florida who are working to make the summit of the Americas, near the end of this year, a success. You know, this meeting that we're going to have will include the Democratic leaders of this entire hemisphere, the Caribbean and Central and South America as well as in North America. We are going to talk about what we can do to strengthen democracy, what we can do to continue to integrate all of the Americas economically, and what we are going to do to help to build a system of sustainable development so that we can preserve our precious natural resources and grow our economies at the same times. It will be an historic meeting, and we are having it right here in Miami.

I told the folks who were there that I had the opportunity last night to talk to the coach of the Brazilian soccer team and the head of the Brazilian Federation of Soccer, once again reminding me of some of the things we have to do as Americans, because he spoke very good English, and I didn't speak his language. But he said an interesting thing to me. He said, "You know, when we all came here we wondered about this World Cup because we knew soccer was not your game. And yet, we've had wonderful attendance. We've had an open door to all of our people coming from other countries to see your games. The American people have made this the best World Cup ever." Well, it put me to thinking, soccer may not be our game, but democracy is; enterprise is; diversity as a strength is. We can make the summit of the Americas a truly historic event for all of you in this room and all you represent. Twenty years from now we'll look back on what is happening in Miami at the end of this year as one of the most important events, paving

the way to the right kind of future in the 21st century.

Let me say this strategy is working, bringing the deficit down, investing more in education and training, investing more in new technologies, opening new trade opportunities, it's working. In the last 18 months, our economy has generated more than 3.8 million jobs, the unemployment rate has dropped 1.7 percent. Last year we had the largest number of new businesses started in the United States than any year since the end of World War II. We are going in the right direction.

But we know we need to do more. We know we have to give our citizens the confidence they need to grow. We know that among Latinos there has been stronger support for the idea of education and hard work through education as the way out of poverty and the way to the American dream than perhaps any other community in the United States. But we also know that we have not yet provided our people with the kind of lifetime learning opportunities that we now know are necessary to succeed and win in the global economy. The average person, after all, will change jobs seven times in a lifetime. So we need a world-class system that starts from the day someone enrolls in kindergarten or pre-school to the day they finish high school, to the day they go to college or go into a job-training program or go into work for the first time, until the day they retire. And we are working on that.

This year the Congress has provided, largely on a completely bipartisan basis, perhaps the most important education reforms we have had in a generation, a total reform of the Head Start system serving more children at a younger age; expansion of childhood immunization; the Goals 2000 bill, which sets international educational goals for all of our schools and encourages grassroots reforms to meet them; the school-to-work transition bill, which trains young people who don't go on to college but who do need at least 2 years of further training to get good jobs with a growing income. We must do that for every one of our noncollege-bound young people. And we are now considering a way to change the unemployment system into a reemployment system so that when people

lose their jobs they can immediately begin to retrain for the jobs of tomorrow.

Now, when you put all that with what the Congress did last year in the economic program, which was to reform the college loans so that—listen to this, we made 20 million Americans eligible for lower interest rates, better repayment on their college loans, so that no one should ever not go to college again because of the cost of a college education. We are on the right track to the future.

We are trying to do things that honor your values: opportunity, responsibility, community, and the soul of the Hispanic culture, our families. Last year we enacted the Family Medical Leave Law, and we cut taxes on 15 million working families to encourage people to stay in the work force, not to slip back into welfare. We established a White House commission on Hispanic educational excellence, chaired by Raul. And I am confident that he will find even more ways for us to help the people who need help.

Our program of national service, AmeriCorps, has benefited from the guidance of La Raza. This year we will have 20,000 young Americans all across the country working in their communities to deal with problems and earning money to continue their education. Year after next we can have 100,000 young Americans rebuilding America from the grassroots up. In Texas alone, the community service program helped to immunize 100,000 extra children in the first year it was in place.

To give you an idea of the dimensions of what national service can do for America, in your communities, in the largest year of participation of the Peace Corps, the largest number we ever had participating was 16,000. We'll have 20,000 this year in national service, 100,000 the year after next. It can help to rebuild America. And the spirit of La Raza should be there in project after project after project after project.

There are two issues I want to speak with you about in closing today, without which we cannot make America what it ought to be. The first is crime. It is tearing our country apart, costing us too much in money and in humanity. And we have to take control of our streets and our neighborhoods again.

Right now we are very close to winning passage of an historic crime bill that would put 100,000 more police officers on the street, a 20 percent increase in the number of police officers on the street. It would ban assault weapons that too often make gangs better armed than the police who are supposed to be protecting the American people. And I might add, for those of you who come from rural sporting constituencies like mine, it would identify over 600 sporting and hunting weapons that could not be banned or restricted in any way. It is a law enforcement measure.

It would provide tougher penalties for repeat offenders, more money for local governments to build jail cells but, for the first time ever, \$8 billion in prevention, to give our young people something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.

But we've been slowed down in the last few weeks, and we need to speed up to pass the crime bill. If anybody doubts why we need it, notice your morning papers. Yesterday, the Department of Justice released a study that showed that in America children between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely to be beaten, raped, and robbed than adults in America. Children are the new victims of crime in America. Our children are the most common victims. And the trends are not good because our children are also more and more likely to be the most common perpetrators. Violent crimes committed against children are up 23 percent since 1987, even in many cities where the overall crime rate is going down. We are allowing our children to be terrorized, a generation of children to be lost in place after place in America, and we must stop it.

And this problem is infecting people without regard to their race. I'll never forget meeting the parents of Polly Klaas, who was kidnapped from her bedroom in Petaluma, California, and subsequently killed. And then there was the letter I got in late April or early May, which a lot of you remember, from 9-year-old James Darby of New Orleans. He wrote me this letter and pleaded with me to do something about the crime problem. He said, "I think somebody might kill me, and I'm asking you nicely to do something about it." Nine days later he was

gunned down—9 years old, writing the President, pleading for help. Then yesterday we get the statistical horror that our children are 5 times more likely to be victimized than the rest of us.

The names of Polly Klaas and James Darby and all the others we're going to lose if we don't act—it's time, it's time to put all of our differences aside, to work out the problems we have to work out and pass that crime bill. Every day, every week, every month that goes by is another period of time when the police aren't on the street, when the assault weapons ban is not in place, when the tougher penalties on repeat offenders are not in place, when we don't have the prevention programs on the streets in every neighborhood in the United States. This is the best and biggest and most significant fight on crime in the history of the United States, and we ought to act on it and do it now.

The other problem I need your help on and I have to thank you for is health care. I want to thank first La Raza for issuing its statement in favor of universal coverage and shared responsibility. But I also want to talk frankly about this. You know, for 60 years our country has tried under Presidents of both parties to reform our health care system, to provide health security for all Americans. And we have never been able to do it.

There are reasons for that. But first, let me ask you to look at the system we have now. What is good about it? The doctors, the nurses, the technology, the medical research: If you can get it, it is the finest in the world. And there are a lot of selfless people. I have been to a public health clinic here in Miami that I will never forget, treating people without regard to their means and giving the best health care they possibly could.

But if you look at our system and compare it to others and if you want America to compete and win in the global economy, we must be willing to rigorously compare ourselves to others, both our strengths and our weaknesses. Here are the facts: We spend a bigger percentage of our income, 14.5 percent, on health care, than any other country. Nobody is over 10. Canada spends 10 percent; Germany and Japan spend about 8.5 percent.

But we are the only nation that simply cannot figure out how to cover everybody; in fact, we're going in reverse. Ten years ago, 88 percent of our people were covered with health insurance or covered by Government programs. Today we're back to 83 and dropping.

States have struggled with reforms. Forty States have enacted various kinds of insurance reforms. Of the States which have acted, 30 of those States have still had an increase in the number of people without insurance. You say, "Well, 83 percent, that means only one in six Americans don't have health insurance. That's not too bad. Even though nobody else would tolerate it, it's not too bad." But it is bad. Why? Because nearly everybody can lose your health insurance. Who can't lose their insurance? If you're rich, you can always buy it. If you're poor, the Government will give it to you. If you're in jail, you'll get it. If you work for the Government, you'll get it. Anybody else can lose it, even if you've got it. And we simply have to find a way to deal with this.

The second big problem we have is—I saw all of you nodding your heads when I was talking about education and training out there, identifying with what I said. Most Americans without regard to their party would say the United States today should be spending more investing in our future, more on education and training, more on airports, more on roads, more on technology, more to build a powerful economy. You ought to look at your Federal Government budget.

Now, I am proud of the fact that we're eliminating 100 programs and cutting over 200 others. Proud of the fact that I gave the Congress the first budget in 25 years, if it passes this way, that will actually reduce domestic spending, excluding health care and the other things we've called entitlements. But if you look at what we're doing, we are cutting defense, and I don't believe we can cut it much more. We are right at the edge, below which we shouldn't go. We've cut it dramatically.

We're holding all other domestic spending constant, and health care is exploding. We're exploding health care costs at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation, paying more for the same health care. You're going to be listening to Presidential campaigns from now till king-

dom come if we don't do something about health care where the people running will be standing up and telling you something that's not so because they won't be able to spend a nickel to see the cow jump over the Moon. They will have to spend all the money, pay more every year for the same health care.

Small businesses in America are paying 30 percent more on average than big business and Government. And more and more people are going without health care coverage. Now, this is the biggest issue, a bigger issue to Hispanic-Americans than any other group. Why? Because more working Hispanics are uninsured than any other group of Americans. More than 32 percent of the Hispanic population is uninsured, compared to 13 percent for Anglo-Americans and 20 percent for African-Americans.

Why is that? Is that because more of you are on welfare? No. If you were on welfare you'd have health insurance. It's because you are working for small business people or part-time for jobs that do not have health benefits, often for employers that honestly cannot afford health benefits in the current environment.

Now, one of the real problems we have with this debate is that the people who want to stop us from fixing it say they're sticking up for small business. They say that small business can't afford one percent of payroll or 2 percent of payroll to provide for health care. The problem is that most small businesses today are trying to provide health care, and they're paying too much for two reasons: number one, because they're having to carry the burden for those who won't do anything for their employees and, number two, because they're small, they can't get the same good rates that people who work for Government and big business can. And it's not right.

We have always believed that the States were the laboratories of democracy. I'm supporting the State of Florida now in a very innovative thing they want to do with health care. But we do have one State, Hawaii, who 20 years ago decided that there ought to be shared responsibility, a 50-50 deal, employers pay half of health insurance and employees pay half of it and everybody gets covered. They have about 98 percent coverage. Their infant mortality rate has dropped by 50 per-

cent. Their average longevity is more than the national average.

You say, "Well, Hawaii is healthy, happy place. We all go there to play golf, or whatever." The truth is that 20 percent of their health burden are poor native islanders. And the most important thing is that small business premiums there are 30 percent below the national average. Why? Because nobody is refusing to do their part and because the little guys can join together in big pools and get the same costs that bigger employers can.

My fellow Americans, the Hispanic community has always stood for work over welfare, for holding families together against all the odds, and for the notion that the community was important, that we all became more by working together and being loyal to one another than we could just pursuing our individual destinies. And yet we are living in a country that is the only advanced country in the world that cannot figure out how to cover all of its people. We are punishing the small businesses who try to do the right thing. We are spending 40 percent more of our income than anybody else. We are losing ground on coverage every day. And a lot of people say that what we ought to do is put a Band-Aid on the present system.

I say to you, this is one issue where the political rhetoric is divorced from the reality. The right thing to do for small business that will generate more jobs is to ask everybody to be responsible, give small business a break, give small business the voluntary opportunity to join a buying cooperative so they can get better rates, but cover everybody. Cover everybody.

We have experience. We know what works and what doesn't. This is a very tough fight because we are spending so much of our money on health care on things that relate to the financing of health care, not keeping people healthy or treating them when they're sick. And a lot of people don't want to change the status quo. But if you look at the trends, it is truly frightening. Thirty-two percent of Hispanic-Americans, working people—of all the people in America without health insurance today, 85 percent of them get up every day and work for a living. And if they would quit and go on welfare, we'd give them good health care.

Is that the message we want to send to our people? Is that the message we want to send to our children? Do you want health care for sure? Go on welfare, go to jail, get elected to Congress, or get rich. [Laughter] I'm not criticizing the Congress; be a Federal employee, be the President. Be President. I've got it, and I'm not going to lose it. And it's not right. And we know what to do. Do we have the will, do we have the courage, do we have the vision to do it?

I ask you this because it isn't just that one in six Americans don't have health insurance; it isn't just that one in three Hispanics don't have health insurance; it's that the two and three who do have it could lose it. Eighty-one million of us live in families like Henry Cisneros' family, where his young son, who means more to him than anything in the world, has fought a heroic battle against a tragic health problem. And he works for us, so he's got health insurance. What if Henry Cisneros were a traveling salesman? What in God's name would have happened to his son?

There are 81 million of us that live in these families. We owe it to them to be able to work, to grow, to flourish, to take care of their children. Or if their wives get premature breast cancer or a man has a heart attack at 40, we cannot shut them down. And unless you cover everybody, if you try to fix their problem, the only thing you're going to do is raise everybody else's insurance and have more middle class people losing their insurance. We know what to do. Do we have the courage to do it?

La Raza is here after 26 years because you kept pushing people to change, because you did not deny the existence of real problems but instead embraced the exhilaration of dealing with them. Now, I know a lot of the things I do as President aren't always popular, but I'll tell you what, I show up for work every day and I ask people to face real problems. This is a real problem. Crime is a real problem. Welfare is a real problem. Continuing to make this economy go forward is a real problem. They are also enormous opportunities. This is the greatest country in human history. I believe we can deal with this if you'll give us the energy and support we need to do it.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. at the Miami Beach Convention Center.

Statement on the Attack on the Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires

July 18, 1994

The United States deeply regrets the loss of life caused by the cowardly attack Monday against the Israeli-Argentine Mutual Association in Buenos Aires.

This terrible loss of innocent life must not deter civilized society from opposing the enemies of peace.

The United States will redouble its efforts on behalf of peace in the Middle East and elsewhere and offers its full assistance and cooperation in helping to identify and locate those responsible for this brutal act.

Message to the Congress on Libya

July 18, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of February 10, 1994, concerning the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order No. 12543 of January 7, 1986. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA"), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Corporation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c).

1. As previously reported, on December 2, 1993, I renewed for another year the national emergency with respect to Libya pursuant to IEEPA. This renewal extended the current comprehensive financial and trade embargo against Libya in effect since 1986. Under these sanctions, all trade with Libya is prohibited, and all assets owned or controlled by the Libyan government in the United States or in the possession or control of U.S. persons are blocked. In addition, I have instructed the Secretary of Commerce to reinforce our current trade embargo against Libya by prohibiting the re-export

from foreign countries to Libya of certain U.S.-origin products, including equipment for refining and transporting oil, unless consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution 883.

2. There have been two amendments to the Libyan Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 550 (the "Regulations"), administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("FAC") of the Department of the Treasury, since my last report on February 10, 1994. The first amendment (59 *Fed. Reg.* 5105, February 3, 1994) revoked section 550.516, a general license that unblocked deposits in currencies other than U.S. dollars held by U.S. persons abroad otherwise blocked under the Regulations. This amendment is consistent with action by the United Nations Security Council in Resolution 883 of November 11, 1993. The Security Council determined in that resolution that the continued failure of the Government of Libya ("GoL") to demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of terrorism, and in particular the GoL's continued failure to respond fully and effectively to the requests and decisions of the Security Council in Resolutions 731 and 748, concerning the bombing of the Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 flights, constituted a threat to international peace and security. Accordingly, Resolution 883 called upon Member States, *inter alia*, to freeze certain GoL funds or other financial resources in their territories, and to ensure that their nationals did not make such funds or any other financial resources available to the GoL or any Libyan undertaking as defined in the resolution. In light of this resolution, FAC revoked section 550.516 to eliminate a narrow exception that had existed to the comprehensive blocking of GoL property required by Executive Order No. 12544 of January 8, 1986 (3 C.F.R., 1986 Comp., p. 183), and by the Regulations. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

On March 21, 1994, FAC amended the Regulations to add new entries to appendices A and B (59 *Fed. Reg.* 13210). Appendix A ("Organizations Determined to be Within the Term 'Government of Libya' (Specially Designated Nationals of Libya)") is a list of organizations determined by the Director of FAC to be within the definition of the term

"Government of Libya" as set forth in section 550.304(a) of the Regulations, because they are owned or controlled by, or act or purport to act directly or indirectly on behalf of, the GoL. Appendix B ("Individuals Determined to be Specially Designated Nationals of the Government of Libya") lists individuals determined by the Director of FAC to be acting or purporting to act directly or indirectly on behalf of the GoL, and thus to fall within the definition of the term "Government of Libya" in section 550.304(a).

Appendix A to part 550 was amended to provide public notice of the designation of North Africa International Bank as a Specially Designated National ("SDN") of Libya. Appendix A was further amended to add new entries for four banks previously listed in Appendix A under other names. These banks are Banque Commerciale du Niger (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Nigerienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), Banque Commerciale du Sahel (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Malienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), Chinguetty Bank (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Mauritanienne pour le Commerce Exterieur et le Developpement), and Societe Inter africaine du Banque (formerly Banque Arabe Libyenne Togolaise pour le Commerce Exterieur). These banks remain listed in Appendix A under their former names as well.

Appendix B to Part 550 was amended to provide public notice of three individuals determined to be SDNs of the GoL: Seddigh Al Kabir, Mustafa Saleh Gibril, and Farag Al Amin Shallouf. Each of these three individuals is a Libyan national who occupies a central management position in a Libyan SDN financial institution.

All prohibitions in the Regulations pertaining to the GoL apply to the entities and individuals identified in appendices A and B. All unlicensed transactions with such entities or persons, or transactions in which they have an interest, are prohibited unless otherwise exempted or generally licensed in the Regulations. A copy of the amendment is attached to this report.

3. During the current 6-month period, FAC made numerous decisions with respect to applications for licenses to engage in trans-

actions under the Regulations, issuing 69 licensing determinations—both approvals and denials. Consistent with FAC's ongoing scrutiny of banking transactions, the largest category of license approvals (33) concerned requests by non-Libyan persons or entities to unblock bank accounts initially blocked because of an apparent GoL interest. The largest category of denials (18) was for banking transactions in which FAC found a GoL interest. Four licenses were issued authorizing intellectual property protection in Libya.

4. During the current 6-month period, FAC continued to emphasize to the international banking community in the United States the importance of identifying and blocking payments made by or on behalf of Libya. The FAC worked closely with the banks to implement new interdiction software systems to identify such payments. As a result, during the reporting period, more than 126 transactions involving Libya, totaling more than \$14.7 million, were blocked. Four of these transactions were subsequently licensed to be released, leaving a net amount of more than \$12.7 million blocked.

Since my last report, FAC collected 15 civil monetary penalties totaling nearly \$144,000 for violations of the U.S. sanctions against Libya. Twelve of the violations involved the failure of banks to block funds transfers to Libyan-owned or -controlled banks. The other three penalties were received for violations involving letter of credit and export transactions.

Various enforcement actions carried over from previous reporting periods have continued to be aggressively pursued. Open cases as of May 27, 1994, totaled 330. Several new investigations of potentially significant violations of the Libyan sanctions have been initiated by FAC and cooperating U.S. law enforcement agencies, primarily the U.S. Customs Service. Many of these cases are believed to involve complex conspiracies to circumvent the various prohibitions of the Libyan sanctions, as well as the utilization of international diversionary shipping routes to and from Libya. The FAC has continued to work closely with the Departments of State and Justice to identify U.S. persons who enter into contracts or agreements with the GoL, or other third-country parties, to lobby

United States Government officials and to engage in public relations work on behalf of the GoL without FAC authorization.

On May 4, 1994, FAC released a chart, "Libya's International Banking Connections," which highlights the Libyan government's organizational relationship to 102 banks and other financial entities located in 40 countries worldwide. The chart provides a detailed look at current Libyan shareholdings and key Libyan officers in the complex web of financial institutions in which Libya has become involved, some of which are used by Libya to circumvent U.S. and U.N. sanctions. Twenty-six of the institutions depicted on the chart have been determined by FAC to be SDNs of Libya. In addition, the chart identifies 19 individual Libyan bank officers who have been determined to be Libyan SDNs. A copy of the chart is attached to this report.

In addition, on May 4, 1994, FAC announced the addition of five entities and nine individuals to the list of SDNs of Libya. The five entities added to the SDN list are: Arab Turkish Bank, Libya Insurance Company, Maghreb International Trade Company, Saving and Real Estate Investment Bank, and Soci  t   Maghrebine D'Investissement et de Participation. The nine individuals named in the notice are: Yousef Abd-El-Razegh Abdelmulla, Ayad S. Dahaim, El Hadi M. El-Fighi, Kamel El-Khallas, Mohammed Mustafa Ghadban, Mohammed Lahmar, Ragiab Saad Madi, Bashir M. Sharif, and Kassem M. Sherlala. All prohibitions in the Regulations pertaining to the GoL apply to the entities and individuals identified in the notice issued on May 4, 1994. All unlicensed transactions with such entities or persons, or transactions in which they have an interest, are prohibited unless otherwise exempt or generally licensed in the Regulations. A copy of the notice is attached to this report.

The FAC also continued its efforts under the Operation Roadblock initiative. This ongoing program seeks to identify U.S. persons who travel to and/or work in Libya in violation of U.S. law.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from January 7, 1994, through July 6, 1994, that are directly attributable to the exercise of powers

and authorities conferred by the declaration of the Libyan national emergency are estimated at approximately \$1 million. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in the Office of Foreign Assets Control, the Office of the General Counsel, and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, and the Department of Commerce.

6. The policies and actions of the GoL continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. The United States continues to believe that still stronger international measures than those mandated by the United Nations Security Council Resolution 883, including a worldwide oil embargo, should be enacted if Libya continues to defy the international community. We remain determined to ensure that the perpetrators of the terrorists acts against Pan Am 103 and UTA 772 are brought to justice. The families of the victims in the murderous Lockerbie bombing and other acts of Libyan terrorism deserve nothing less. I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against Libya fully and effectively, so long as those measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments as required by law.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 18, 1994.

**Message to the Congress
Transmitting the Lithuania-United
States Fishery Agreement
July 18, 1994**

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (Public Law 94-265; 16 U.S.C. 1801 *et seq.*), I transmit herewith an Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania Extending the Agreement of November 12, 1992, Concerning Fisheries off the Coasts of the United States, with annex. The agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Vilnius, Lithuania

on February 22, 1994, and May 11, 1994, extends the 1992 agreement to December 31, 1996. The exchange of notes, together with the 1992 agreement, constitutes a governing international fishery agreement within the requirements of section 201(c) of the Act.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Lithuania, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this agreement at an early date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 18, 1994.

**Statement on Flood Assistance to
Georgia, Alabama, and Florida
July 18, 1994**

The people in the flooded areas face a difficult task in recovering from this major disaster. Our first priority is to help them get their lives in order. These funds will help farmers to clear their property and get their operations running again. They will also help elderly, low income homeowners to restore their damaged homes.

NOTE: This statement was part of a White House announcement of additional assistance to States affected by flooding in the Southeast.

**Remarks at a Democratic Campaign
Reception in Portland, Maine
July 18, 1994**

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you all for that wonderful welcome, and thank you, Senator Mitchell, for your introduction.

You know, I came here today, having left Washington, which is very hot in the summertime, and I flew to Miami, which is much hotter in the summertime. And I thought I would feel out of place when I got up here in the northern climate of Maine. But you kindly put these lights up and made us all feel right at home. [*Laughter*] Of course, I may be the only person up here who is still standing when this event is over—[*laughter*—but I like the warm welcome you have given.

I want to say, too, how glad I am to be here with your State Chair Victoria Murphy. She's providing great leadership. She's got a lot of energy. I like that. We've got a real ethnic blend up here tonight on this ticket: Senator Baldacci—I would do more for him if he'd brought me a little pasta tonight so I could eat—[laughter]—Senator Dutremble. I want you to send them to Congress because it matters whether they're there. You know, if a President doesn't want to do anything, it doesn't make much difference who's in Congress. If you get elected to do things to move the country forward, you can't do it unless there are people in Congress who will help. I need them there. More importantly, you need them there, and I want you to send them there.

I love hearing Joe Brennan remind you that, when we were much younger, we served as both attorney general and Governor together. And he said he had notes—you know, I've gotten to the point where I can't remember anything. Joe, I'd like to have those notes back. [Laughter] I will say this: I loved serving with Joe Brennan. And I got to know him pretty well. And there's a kind of nice and unusual camaraderie that often develops among the people who serve in the Governor's group. I've been for him every time he's been on the ballot up here, and I'm glad to see that you're going to send him back to the Governor's office where he belongs.

I'd like to say something about Tom Andrews and this Senate seat in connection with George Mitchell. Most of you know from my last trip to Maine what I think of Senator Mitchell and how much I feel indebted to him and how much I think the country is indebted to him. On the night that he called to tell me that he was going to announce the next day that he would not seek reelection, first of all, I accused him of dealing with it on the telephone because he couldn't stand to see a grown man cry. [Laughter] And secondly, I talked to him a second time and a third time, and finally he said, "Look," he said, "Tom Andrews will run, and he'll win, and he'll be just great."

But I want to try to put into some sharp relief what Senator Mitchell said about the voting patterns of the parties. You know, I

ran for President as the Governor of my State because I was worried about our country. I was worried about what our future would be like. I was worried about what my daughter would grow up to live in. I thought the economy was going in the wrong direction, the people were coming apart when they ought to be pulling together, and that Government was not working for ordinary people. And I believed that in order for us to go into the 21st century at this moment of enormous opportunity—the end of the cold war, the emergence of a real global village on this planet of ours—in order for us to go into that century strong and healthy and robust, giving every boy and girl the chance to live up to the fullest of their God-given capacities, in a world that was more peaceful, more prosperous, more sane, we had to get the economy turned around, we had to pull the American people together, we had to get this Government to work for ordinary folks again—straightforward, simple, direct objectives.

And the first thing we had to do was to get our economic house in order. It was amazing to me the difference between the rhetoric and the reality of the politics of the last dozen years. When the other crowd was in, they always talked about how much they hated Government and they hated tax-and-spend, they hated this, that, and the other thing, and how evil the deficits were, and how they were trying to be tough. I looked at the facts and I realized that whatever you want to say about Congress, they actually appropriated slightly less money than the previous two Presidents asked them to spend but not enough to overcome the recommendations they made, which cut taxes on the wealthy, raised them on the middle class, exploded the deficit, and drove the economy downhill.

And so I asked the Congress to do something hard, not something easy; not where we would talk one way and do another but where we'd actually do what we said we were going to do: make the tax system fair and bring the deficit down. And the Congress voted by the narrowest of margins—literally by one vote in both Houses—for a plan that had \$255 billion in spending cuts; provided tax cuts for 15 million American working

families, including almost 61,000 families in Maine; asked the wealthiest 1½ percent of our population, including about 3,700 families in Maine, to pay a tax increase; provided a tax reduction for 90 percent of the small businesses in this country that would invest more in their businesses—90 percent of them—and basically brought about the biggest deficit reduction package in history.

Then this year, we followed up with a budget that eliminates 100 Government programs outright, cuts over 200 others, continues to reduce by attrition the size of the Federal work force, so that by 1999 it will be the smallest it has been since John Kennedy was President of the United States. These are things that the Democrats did. And at the same time we increased our spending on Head Start; we increased our spending on education and training of the work force; we increased our spending on defense conversion like the project that the Bath Iron Works got here to develop commercial shipping; we increased our spending on new technologies for the future; we reformed the student loan laws and made 20 million American students eligible for lower interest rates and better repayment terms.

And we got, as George Mitchell said, 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President of the United States of America. And what are the results: 3.8 million new jobs; in Maine, 17,000 private sector jobs in a year and a half, after 4 years in which you lost 30,000 jobs; last year the largest number of new business starts in America since the end of World War II. That is the record. And the record was established by one vote in both Houses, because the rhetoric, the forces against change, hanging on—so they're coming back one more time talking about tax and spend. When you hear it in a Senate race, you just remember this: When the chips were down, Tom Andrews didn't blink.

When he went up there and cast that vote, he didn't do it for me; he didn't do it for the Congress; he didn't do it for the Democratic Party. He did it for you. He did it for you. And believe it or not, a higher percentage of citizens in the other congressional district in Maine got a tax cut than the ones in his own. But he said yes, and his opponent

said no because the other party gave marching orders that no one who wanted to stay in good graces could vote for this plan—no one. They were told no, no, no. Well, we said yes to America. We got 3.8 million new jobs, a point and a half off the unemployment rate, a growing economy, a declining deficit because of that one vote. You need to swell those numbers. Send these men to the Congress. Send him to the Senate, and send a message to America.

Now, we got the same thing all over again on issue after issue after issue. Now we're trying to get a crime bill out of the Congress. It will have bipartisan support if we can just get it to a vote because no one will vote against crime now. This is a big deal. This administration and our allies in Congress are going to provide a 20-percent increase in the number of police officers on the street, not just to catch criminals but to deter crime.

Violent crime has increased by 300 percent in the last 30 years. The number of police officers on the street have increased by 10 percent. It's not hard to figure out what's going on here. We're also going to provide billions of dollars in Maine and all across the country for prevention programs, so that young people will have something to say yes to, not just something to say no to—never been done before in a crime bill, ever in the history.

We are trying to do things. And now, in the last great battle of his career in the Senate, Senator Mitchell's trying to help me pass health care reform. And I want to tell you exactly what we're up against. You know, 500 years ago the Italian political philosopher Machiavelli said, "There is nothing so difficult in all of human affairs than to change the established order of things," because the people who will lose what they have will fight you tooth and nail. That's Arkansas, not Machiavelli. [Laughter] But that's what he said. They'll fight you tooth and nail, and the people who will benefit will always be a little hesitant being unsure of the benefit of change.

Now, what have we achieved already? For the first time ever in the history of the Congress, we have three congressional committees that have voted out plans to provide health care for all Americans. That's never

happened before. We never even got a bill out of committee in 60 years of trying.

But again, in this issue, just like on the budget, there's been this huge disconnect between the rhetoric and the reality. All those television ads they ran against our plan, they said, "They're going to take your choice of doctor away." Folks, you're losing your choices of doctors now. We're going to give it back to you. They said we're going to ration health care. There are 39 million Americans without health insurance today. They're being rationed right now. They said that we were going to totally mess up this system with bureaucracy and regulation.

Well, let me tell you what we've done. We've made our plan less bureaucratic and less regulatory. We've given small business the option to join big buyers cooperatives. But most of them will do it so they can buy health insurance cheaper instead of more expensive now. Under the present system, small business pays 30 to 40 percent more than big business and government. We provided more help to small business so they can afford to cover their employees more. We have met every criticism that's been leveled against us, except we haven't walked away from trying to provide full coverage to all Americans and trying to constrain the cost of health care and trying to help working families and the elderly with prescription drug benefits and long-term care. We haven't walked away from that. We're still trying to do the things that America needs.

Now, our opponents say this is bad for small business. But let's look at the facts. Most small businesses insure their employees today and they're paying an enormous price for it. Why? Because they pay for everybody that doesn't cover their employees; because, keep in mind, if you get real sick, you show up at the emergency room, you get health care, the rest of us pay the bill; and because small businesses don't have the bargaining power that big business and Government does.

Now, what has happened? We're the only country in the world that this has happened to. In the last 10 years—10 years ago 88 percent of the American people had health coverage; today only 83 percent do. We're going in reverse. That's more than one in six Ameri-

cans. You think, well, I'm not one of the one in six. Well, let me tell you, if you're very wealthy or you're very poor or you're a politician or you're in jail, you'll always have health care. Otherwise, you might lose it. So just because you're not one of the one in six now doesn't mean you won't be.

Who have we guaranteed health care to in America? Our elderly on Medicare. If you tried to repeal Medicare today there would be a riot, wouldn't there? There would be a riot in America, and there ought to be. Don't working class, middle class Americans deserve the same thing? I think they do.

Now, we have people that say, "Well, let's just tinker around, do a little here, a little there." The problem is that in good conscience I'm not against doing a little, but I want it to be a good little, not a bad little. The truth is there's a lot of evidence that if you just tinker around with some of these recommendations that our opponents have put out, you might actually raise insurance rates more, not help working people at all, and have more people lose their insurance.

Now, this is amazing. We spend 14 percent of our income on health care. Canada spends 10 percent, Germany spends 8½ percent. Nobody's even close to us. Yet everybody else covers 96, 97, 98 percent of the people, and we cover 83 percent. And we're supposed to defend this.

Yes, our doctors are great; our nurses are great; our medical schools are great. We can pay for all that. We can even pay for all the terrible tragedies of increased violence, high rates of AIDS and things like that, and have money left over if we have the courage to reorganize the way health care is financed. This is about finance. This is not about anything else.

So I say to you, we need to complete a battle that was begun by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman that has never been completed. And to show you how far our friends in the other party have gone, in 1972-'71—President Richard Nixon recommended that all Americans be covered by health care and that employers and employees split the bill. They now think that is a radical, liberal idea. [Laughter] Every time George Mitchell has reached out to compromise, they have moved further away. This must not be about politics.

It must not be about rhetoric. It must not be about party. It should be about health care, the human beings of the United States of America.

I just want to tell you one thing. You know, my wife and I have gotten about a million letters from Americans. And when I go places, normally we'll call some of the letter writers and ask them if they'll come meet us, just so the press and the public in communities can see these people. I was in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, the other day, a little town in western Pennsylvania, and I was introduced by two women. One of them's name was Louise. She's not the one on the ad. [Laughter] The other one's name was Lynn. One woman was a 62-year-old dairy farmer.

And you know, I grew up in a farming State, once lived on a farm, and that's why I got into politics, I didn't want to work that hard. [Laughter] There is nothing more difficult than being a dairy farmer. You've got to do it 7 days a week. You can't tell the cows to stop growing milk. [Laughter] It's a very tough thing. At the age of 62 this woman and her husband lost their health insurance. They just simply couldn't afford it anymore. They just kept exploding the price over and over and over again. What are we to say to her, "Here's a country that believes in work, family, and community; it's tough luck for you"? The other woman, the mother of five children, had her husband stand up, we looked at him. We thought they were fine people. They had five kids. She had cancer and is recovering, but you know he lost one job, changed it, lost their insurance. What do we say to them? What I want you to know is it's not just one in six; it can happen to nearly anybody.

I'm trying to get all these people to leave welfare and go to work. They leave welfare, go to work, start paying taxes, lose their health care, and pay taxes for somebody else's health care. What do we say to them? You know, a lot of these people that demonstrate against me at these health care meetings say I'm trying to have socialized medicine and all this bull. It's not true. It's private insurance we're advocating. They think they ought to put Harry Truman on Mount Rushmore. But, now folks, I come

from one of those families that was for Harry Truman when he was living. [Laughter] And I am telling you, the same crowd used the same arguments against Harry Truman. And they bad-mouthed him, and they said he was rube, and he didn't deserve to be President, even though he had finished the Second World War and led the world in organizing the institutions of the post-cold-war era. They talked about how he was incompetent and in over his head and didn't know what he was doing. And they demeaned him with the same arguments they're using today.

It has always been difficult to change. But we turned this economy around. We're opening up the global economy. We're laying the foundations for peace and security in the 21st century. But if you want us to have money that you pay to the Federal Government to invest in education and training and new technology and hope for the future, we've got to do something to restrain health care costs and to provide health security to all Americans. We have got to do it.

Now, there is one thing you can do to get it done. You can make your voices heard and you can elect these two fine men to the House of Representatives. You can elect Tom Andrews to the Senate. You can elect Joe Brennan to the Governor's office. You can send a message to America that you are on the side of change.

Thank you. And God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:30 p.m. in the Eastland Ballroom at the Sonesta Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to John E. Baldacci, State senator in Maine, and Dennis L. Dutremble, president, Maine senate.

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session With the National Governors' Association in Boston, Massachusetts

July 19, 1994

The President. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Governor Campbell. Governor Dean, Governor Weld, thank you for hosting the Governors in your latest expression of bipartisan support, showing up at the Democratic Governors' party last night. That's broadening your base here.

I want to join many others here in saying a word of best wishes to Governor Edgar as he continues his recovery and to say to all of you who are leaving the Governors conference this year who served with me, how much I wish you well and how much I enjoyed serving with you over the years.

I always look forward to this day every year. I feel that I have in many ways come home whenever I come back here. There are many ways in which I miss being a Governor, because Governors are so much less isolated from real life than Presidents. Neighbors stop you on the street and talk about their jobs and businesses, about their children and their parents, and the things that we in Washington call issues take on a very human face. And I must say I have worked hard to try to find ways to keep the human face on the issues with which we all deal.

It was as a Governor that I learned and lived the idea that the purpose of public life is actually to get people together to solve problems, not to posture for the next election with rhetoric. In my time in the NGA I was proud to work in a bipartisan fashion on issues of education and welfare reform, on trade and economic development and, yes, on bipartisan suggestions we Governors had for reducing the Federal deficit.

I ran for President because I did not want us to go into the 21st century without a vision of how we could restore our economy and unite our people, make Government work for ordinary Americans again because I thought that our politics was too burdened by partisan rhetoric and too little concerned with practical progress. In the last year and a half I have set about to implement the vision that I brought to that campaign, one that grew directly out of the experiences I had with most of you around this table. We worked to get our economic house in order, to reverse the trend of exploding deficits and declining investments in America.

The economic plan the Congress adopted last year contained \$255 billion in spending cuts, tax cuts for 15 billion working families, made 90 percent of the small businesses in American eligible for tax cuts, increased taxes on the wealthiest 1.5 percent of our people, reduced the Federal payroll by a quarter million, and will give us—along with this year's

budget which eliminated over 100 Government programs, cuts 200 others, and takes the payroll deduction to 272,000, meaning that in 1999 the Federal Government will be below 2 million for the first time since John Kennedy was President—these two budgets will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States.

In the aftermath of that, our economy has produced 3.8 million jobs in 18 months; the unemployment rate is down 1.7 percent. In 1993 we had the largest number of new businesses incorporated in America in any year since the end of World War II. In the first quarter of this year, it was the first time in 16 years we'd gone for a quarter without a bank failure in America. So I believe that we are moving in the right direction.

I want to thank the Governors, in particular, for your continued and consistent support for expanding trade, for NAFTA which is working superbly, by the way. Our trade to Mexico is growing dramatically. Mexico's trade to us is growing as well, but our trade to Mexico is growing more rapidly than that with any other country. We have already sold 5 times more automobiles to Mexico this year than last year.

I thank you for your statement of support on GATT. We must muster through the bipartisan majority we need in Congress to ratify the GATT this year. It will create a half million high-wage jobs in America between now and the end of the decade.

I thank you for your support of the Asian-Pacific initiative we began in Seattle, Washington, last year. And I was with Governor Chiles yesterday in Florida to meet with the committee on the Summit of the Americas which we will have with all the democratic governments in this hemisphere in South America at the end of this year.

These are things which will make a huge difference in our economic future. There are many of you who have also helped us to invest more in defense conversion and new technology, saving the space station, trying to move from a defense to a domestic economy, trying to develop technologies which clean the environment and produce jobs at the same time.

I want to especially thank you also for the work we have been able to do, probably the most in education and training that's been done in any single year in the last 30 years. And the Governors, on a bipartisan basis, have supported that. We have expanded and reformed the Head Start program, increased immunizations, passed the Goals 2000 bill which ratifies your national education goals in Federal law with bipartisan support, passed the school-to-work bill, which will support your efforts to help young people who leave high school and don't go on to 4-year colleges but do need 2 years of further education and training. We also have reformed the student loan laws which will make 20 million young Americans eligible for lower interest and better repayment schedules under the student loan program of the United States.

And finally, we have still pending in the Congress this year the reemployment bill which will change the whole focus of the unemployment systems in ways that will benefit the economy of every State represented around these tables because for too long our unemployment system has been just that. It has paid people while they exhausted their unemployment on the assumption they would be called back to their old jobs when as a practical matter few of them, one in five Americans, are called back to their old jobs these days. They need to begin immediately retraining for the new jobs of the future. That's what the reemployment system will do. And I look forward to working with you on that, the last leg in this revolution in the lifetime learning system of the United States.

Let me just mention a couple of other issues, if I might, before moving to health care. The Governors have been concerned, some of us almost obsessed, with the question of welfare reform for many years now. Our State was one of the first States selected to be a demonstration project for a lot of these ideas way back in 1980, in the last year of the Carter administration.

The work the Governors did together on the Family Support Act of 1988 is still the best example of anything that's been done in the welfare reform area. Now we are seeking to go beyond that. Many of you with your State initiatives—we have granted several

welfare waivers and expect to grant some more, and with the debate about to start in the Congress, I just want to say a couple of words about it. It is important that we pass a new welfare reform bill that builds on what we did in 1988 and what those of you who have worked hard to do right in your States are doing. It is important that we dramatically increase the national efforts to do what you need the National Government to do, including adopting some national rules on tough enforcement of child support. Some of you have done remarkable things there, but if we have some national systems we can do a much better job in collecting billions and billions of dollars in overdue child support, the absence of which drives people into welfare.

It is important that we provide maximum leeway for continuing State experimentation. I have said over and over again to members of both parties in the Congress, no one understands how to fully solve this riddle. So, whatever we do in the national welfare reform legislation, it is imperative that we still leave the States some room to continue to experiment.

Finally, I hope that all of us will support the notion that there ought to be some period after which we end welfare as we know it. Yesterday I was in Florida, and I shook hands with a lot of people who came to this reception. We were talking about the Summit of the Americas, after which these two young women who were born in another country, I think—they spoke English with very pronounced accents—but they were working at the hotel. They said they were American citizens. They wanted to know if they could have their picture taken with the President, and they wanted to tell me something about the welfare system, these two young women that were working at the hotel. And both of them said, "Take all that money and spend it on child care and training and incentives and whatever, but make all those folks go to work if they can go to work," two people at the hotel, just spontaneous.

So, I say to you, we need to act on that. Both Houses have had hearings: there's a great deal of bipartisan support. I think we have a chance to do it. We have some chance to do it this year, although no one really

thinks we can. If we don't, we certainly ought to pass it early next year.

Let me mention now the crime bill. This crime bill is the most important anticrime legislation ever considered by the Congress. It has broad bipartisan support. There are one or two areas of continuing disagreement, but let me mention what's important about it. It puts 100,000 police on the street over the next 5 years. That's a 20 percent increase. There's been a 300 percent increase in violent crime in the last 30 years and a 10 percent increase in the number of policemen in America. It shouldn't surprise anybody that we have problems dealing with this. We now know that violent crime has shifted downward along the age scale and that people between the ages of 12 and 17 are 5 times more likely to suffer from violent crime than older people. We need community policing. It is in many ways the most important part of the crime bill.

The crime bill has tougher punishment, including the "Three strikes and you're out" law. It bans assault weapons but protects hunting weapons in an innovative and I think very important piece of Federal legislation. It provides more money for prisons, but it also provides billions for prevention.

I must take some exception to what the Republican leader of the Senate said earlier here today on this issue. The prevention money is in there in large measure because the law enforcement officials of the country told us it ought to be in there. It is in there because the people who go out and put their lives on the line every day said to us over and over and over again, "You've got to give these kids something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. If they do something terrible and you have to put them away for a long time, fine. But if you can prevent that through summer jobs, through job training, through midnight basketball, through more people in the Boys Clubs, through these things which work, to give kids who live in neighborhoods that are burdened by the lack of family structure, community structure, and the structure of work, do it. Give them something to say yes to again."

It is a very serious prevention effort. And I think it ought to be supported along with the tougher punishment. And since the law

enforcement officials—the law enforcement coordinating committee represents half a million law enforcement officials in this country, I think that we ought to have that kind of support on a bipartisan basis for continuing the prevention initiative as well.

Let me just mention one other subject before I go on to health care. A big part of reinventing Government to me—and you've heard the Vice President use that slogan. We're coming up on our first anniversary of our reinventing Government kickoff, and he and I will be trying to give you a progress report at the end of the summer when we do that. But let me just say that we've done some things that I think are very important. We're paying for this crime bill not with a tax increase but with a savings which will be achieved by reducing the Federal payroll by 272,000 people, taking people out of the Federal bureaucracy and putting them on the streets of our cities and towns. I think that's reinventing Government at its best. We'll give the money to you, and you spend it to keep the American people safer.

We are trying to make agencies work that for too long were political and ineffective, like the Federal Emergency Management Agency—and I was just with the Governors of Georgia, Florida, and Alabama in the aftermath of their terrible floods—and the Small Business Administration, which I think is commonly recognized as probably at its most effective state in its history.

We have tried to deal with the fact that you bear a disproportionate share of the cost of immigration, those of you with high immigrant populations, and we have increased by one third funding to the States for dealing with immigration problems in the last year and a half. I support the modified Glenn-Kempthorne initiative, and I agree with Senator Dole we ought to pass it, we ought to pass it now, and we ought to put the issue of unfunded mandates behind us. I think it's a very important thing to do.

Finally, let me make this statement and ask for your help. I very strongly support the continued issues of comprehensive waivers in the areas of health care and welfare reform. We have issued, by my last count, 21 comprehensive, sweeping waivers, a lot of little ones but 21 very large ones, 15 or 16 in

the welfare area and 5 or 6 in the health care area, in the last year and a half, slightly more than half of them since I last met with you. I received a report before I came here on all the applications that any of you have pending for comprehensive waivers, and I reviewed them, and I have taken a personal interest in trying to push them through.

I, like you, am concerned by the recent court decision on this issue, and I appreciate your response to that. I just want you to know that we need to work together to figure out what to do about the court decision so we can go on with waivers. I am determined not to permit that court decision to become an excuse to slow down the dramatic increase in experimentation we have at the State level in health care and welfare reform. And I ask you for your support in that.

Now, of course the most politically difficult and politically charged issue we are facing today is the issue of health care. It shouldn't be surprising that for 60 years the American people have seen their leaders periodically try to provide coverage to all Americans and to reform the health care system, only to fail. The most encouraging thing perhaps that has happened today so far is the comment that Senator Dole made that now is the time to act, and he is willing to work all through August and September and October to get something done. That is what we ought to do. We ought to do whatever it takes and work however long it takes on whatever days to takes to get something done.

I would like to set this again into some context. You gave me the privilege of coming to speak with you about this last year, and I don't want to be just going over old ground. But I think it's important, when we decide what it is we should do or shouldn't do, to talk again about what the problem is.

First of all, in the United States we are the only country in the world with an advanced economy that doesn't provide functional full coverage, that is, somewhere 96, 97, 98 percent. Social security has 98 percent. You've always got a few people just walking around out there, so it's impossible to have 100 percent coverage of anything. But all other major nations do this. We don't.

Secondly, in spite of the fact that we don't, we spend 40 percent more of our income

on health care than anybody else. This year we're at about 14.2 percent of our income going to health care. Canada is at 10; Germany is at 8.5. And Germany, as you know, has a very fine pharmaceutical industry, a very fine research industry, and high-quality health care as well.

Because health care costs have been going up faster than the rate of inflation, they have been eating up an ever larger percentage of both national and State budgets. You know this. A lot of you who served for some time have seen your budgets every year go more and more and more for health care, less and less and less for education and for economic development, for tax relief, for whatever else you might wish to do.

If you look at the chart of the Federal budget, it's absolutely stunning. Now, if you start next year and string it out until the end of the decade, we're pretty flat in all discretionary spending. Defense is coming down, and I would argue it's coming down just as much as it can, and it should not be cut more. And health care costs are exploding. The job of being a Congressman or a Senator within 4 or 5 years will amount to showing up in Washington and writing health care checks and going home unless we do something to reverse these trends.

And yet, in spite of the fact that we're spending much more money, we are the only nation in the world that's going in reverse in coverage. Ten years ago, 88 percent of the American people were covered; today, 83 percent are. Now, you may say, "Well, that's just one in six. Well, that's good; 83 percent are covered." The problem is that 16 percent is a lot of folks, for one thing—17 percent.

Secondly and perhaps more importantly, the number of people who are at risk of losing their coverage is far greater. Who's locked into coverage, who's locked in? If you're on Medicaid or you're very poor, you're locked in. If you have Medicare, you're locked in. If you're in jail, you're locked in; you get coverage. If you're very wealthy, you're locked in because you can buy it. If you're a politician or you work for government, you're locked in; you get it. Almost everybody else is at risk of losing their health care. And keep in mind, you have pushed for lifetime learning, you have, be-

cause you recognize that younger workers are going to change jobs seven times in a lifetime.

Now, how are we going to provide that kind of security? And let me say there is a human face behind this. I don't want class warfare, but let's look at the facts. Over 80 percent of all the people without insurance in America are people who work for a living; they're working people. This morning I had coffee with a man named Jim Bryant and his wife, Mary, and their two children because I read about him in the *Boston Globe*. He works 60 hours a week and doesn't have any health insurance. And they talked about how much they worked and said they had a good life and all the extra money they had they were putting away for their kids' college education, but they would be ruined if they ever had an illness.

And I asked him if he could afford to pay something, and he said, "Sure." I said, "Would you like to know how much I pay a month for health care as the President of the United States, or Members of Congress or members of the Federal Government?" He said, "Yes." I said, "We pay about \$100 a month, and our employer, you, pays \$300 a month. And he said, 'I could pay that easy.'" He said, "I could pay twice that."

I was in western Pennsylvania, Governor Casey's State. And by the way, I appreciate your support for reform and your attempt to resolve the abortion issue, Governor Casey. But I was in western Pennsylvania, Greensburg, Pennsylvania; two women got up and spoke before me. I don't know if they were Republicans or Democrats, don't have any idea who they voted for. One of them was a dairy farmer, 62 years old. And you know, that's about the hardest farming there is. You've got to work 7 days a week because you can't tell the cows to quit producing milk. Sixty-two years old, they finally had to give up health care at the time she needed it most, this woman did, she and her husband, because they just couldn't afford it anymore.

And then, after that, a woman spoke who was a mother of five children, and she introduced her husband. She had had cancer, and he had had to change jobs and didn't have health insurance. And there are lots of people out there like that. We're talking millions of

people, not just a few. And the issue is not just them but it's everybody else that could be in that position.

Now, the reason I'm bringing this up is that it is important to understand what the problem is when you analyze what the solution should be. And the problem is not just that one-sixth of the American people don't have health care and that the costs are running out of control but that many, many more Americans are at risk of losing their health care.

So, the question is, what should we do? I recommended a system of private insurance participated in by everybody, with a break for small business that gives them lower cost and allows them to buy insurance, small business and self-employed people and farmers, in big groups the way governments and big employers do, maintaining consumer choice but with cost constraints like managed care. And then I went around the country and listened to people and listened to you all tell me what you thought was wrong with it. And we came back with modifications that had less bureaucracy, fewer boards and commissions, more flexibility for the States, less burden on small business than we originally proposed, more choices for the American people in health care, and a longer phase-in period because there is always a law of intended consequences in everything.

So everybody in this debate agrees we have to phase this in. No one believes we can do it next year. Everybody believes this has to be a multiyear phase-in. Now, that's what we offered, and you can find that in some form or fashion in the bills which are working their way through the Congress.

Now, what is the alternative? If you want to cover everybody, or nearly everybody, near as I can tell there are only three ways to do it. You can do it the way Canada does and the way we do for seniors through Medicare, by having a tax that does it. That didn't seem to me to be feasible, abolishing all private health insurance and replacing it with a tax, although you could do it for even less money than we're spending today and cover everybody.

You can do it the way Hawaii does and the way Germany does and the way most of us do it, by just extending the system we have

now and asking employers to pay some portion of their employee health insurance and asking the employees to pick up the rest.

You could ask the employees who don't have insurance to cover their own insurance and give them a break, if they're low-income people, to do it. The problem with that, obviously, is whether you would encourage everybody who is on the margins to dump their employees.

There may be some other way to do it, but I'm not sure what that would be. You could get close to that, maybe, by a system of subsidies to middle class and lower middle class people and by putting all the small businesses, giving them at least a chance to be in buyers' co-ops and doing something like what Governor McWherter and others have done with the Medicaid program to put it in some sort of managed care situation so you can save some money and provide some money to cover others.

But I ask you to look at the evidence. More than 45 States have passed some sort of partial health care reform and insurance reform in the last few years. But State spending has continued to go up, business spending on health care has continued to go up, and coverage has continued to go down. Indeed, in a study I recently saw, only 10 States actually had reduced the number of uninsured people after all their reforms were implemented, and 5 of them only had reduced the number of uninsured working people, mostly States that had provided very generous benefits for people who would move from welfare to work.

So what are we to do? There was a recent Wall Street Journal article which said that even in States that had insurance reforms without universal coverage, "fewer people have coverage than under the old system." Now, why is this? Why is this? Because the system we have encourages waste and inefficiency and irresponsibility. Under the system we have, people who cover their employees pay for those who don't, indirectly, because people who don't have coverage when they get real sick show up at the emergency room, they get health care, and the costs are passed along. Because, under the system we have, without more people in managed competition environments, the more you do, the

more you earn, whether it's needed or not. Pennsylvania has had a very valuable reform in this regard by simply publishing the costs of various procedures across the State of Pennsylvania, and the results showing that there is not necessarily a correlation between the most expensive care and the best results care. That's something that can be done everywhere.

And finally, it's very expensive because we're the only country in the world that has 1,500 separate companies writing thousands of different policies so that every doctor's office, every hospital, and every insurance company has to hire a slew of clerical people to figure out who is not covered for what. And we pay for all that. That's 4.2 percent difference in America and Canada. Let me just give you an idea about how much that is: That's about \$250 billion a year. That's not chicken feed.

Some of that money is because of medical technology and high quality care; some of that money is because of violence and illness and AIDS; but a lot of that money is pure, old-fashioned inefficiency. And so we have to ask ourselves: What should we do? You have already said no to an alternative proposal that would cap the Federal share of Medicaid, cut Medicare without giving any extra benefits to senior citizens, use money to help the poor, and do nothing for the middle class. I think it is important to take the rhetoric out of this and ask what will work.

I heard again the litany of things that people have said, that we don't want a Government takeover of one-seventh of our economy. No, we don't. That's why I propose doing what Hawaii did. Hawaii is not in control of the health care system, are you, Governor? Private insurance, not a Government takeover.

We don't want job loss. The Congressional Budget Office says there will be job gain if you stop all this cost shifting over a 10-year period. And Hawaii's experience indicates that there will be job gain. We do not want to bankrupt the States, and we don't want to bankrupt the Federal Government. That's why we have to have hard cost estimates. At least we have them on our plan.

Now, I read your proposal, and we have made some changes in our plan to reflect

your proposal, to make it more flexible, respect State initiatives more, have less regulation, don't have mandatory alliances. But the question is, what are we going to do that works?

Just yesterday, the Catholic Health Association released a study conducted by Lewin-VHI which says that if you have insurance reforms and low-income subsidies without having coverage for everybody, middle class people earning between \$20,000 and \$29,000 a year will wind up paying \$484 a year more for their insurance.

Why is that? Because if you require everybody to be covered, and you say they can take it from job to job, but you don't have everyone covered, then more single individuals who think they'll be healthy and live forever won't buy health insurance, more small businesses on the margin will drop it, and the cost will rise for everybody that's left.

So I say to you, you know, it was Senator Chafee, a distinguished Republican Senator from Rhode Island, who said that you can't have these insurance reforms without universal coverage. He said that. I didn't. He said it was difficult to conceive of how you could have a right of people to carry their insurance policies from job to job, to job, unless you had some system in which virtually everybody was covered.

Now, if you look at the Hawaii experience, they have had a program based on employer-employee shared responsibility since 1974, 2 years after it was first proposed by President Nixon and Senator Packwood. They have had it. What's happened? Infant mortality is down by 50 percent. The number of people without insurance has shrunk dramatically. Unemployment has fallen. The cost of living is higher in Hawaii than almost any place in America, with small business premiums at 30 percent below the national average. Why? Because everybody participates, nobody bumps anybody else out of it, and everybody's in big buying pools.

Now, what are we going to do? I will say again, we have to do something that works. We have to do something that works for families like Jim Bryant and his wife and two kids, something that works for the people that are out there in all of your States who are working, who are not.

I was in Columbus, Ohio, the other day, and I talked to a woman who ran a delicatessen. She had 20 full-time employees, 20 part-time employees, and she had had cancer 5 years ago. And she said, "I'm in the worst of all worlds. I cover my 20 full-time employees, and we pay too much because I'm a small business person and I've got a preexisting condition. And I'm at a disadvantage with all my competitors. But I feel guilty that I don't cover my part-time employees. If you had a system where I could buy insurance at a rate competitive with government and big business and where my competitors had no advantage over me, I would gladly do it."

So again I say, I am open to any solution to this. And I believe the States ought to be the laboratories of democracy, and I want you to have more flexibility. But at a certain time, I heard Governor Romer's comment earlier, we have to look at the evidence. And so I say, if you imagine what the world will be like when the century turns and we start a new millennium, if you'll imagine what it would be like in America and what you want it to be like and what you've worked so hard for it to be like, you want us to have a competitive economy; you want our deficit to be under control; you want our debt to be a smaller percentage of our income; you want us to have a system of lifetime learning; you want us to have a trading system where we can grow in a world economy.

You do not want every Governor and every President of both parties in the future to spend all their time writing checks where they're paying more every year for the same health care, and they haven't solved a problem which has been solved elsewhere. All I ask in these closing weeks of this debate is that we take the political air out of the balloon and ask ourselves what will work for ordinary Americans.

Now, let me close just by asking every one of you to read this letter that was published in the Boston Globe this morning because one thing I think every Democrat, every Republican, every independent in America agrees is that for people who have it, we have the best health care in the world. We have the finest medical schools, the finest medical centers, the best medical research. Every-

body agrees on that. Senator Dole and I agree on that. Everybody does.

This is a letter from the people who are providing it in this area. They are part of the 100 people who came to the White House the other day representing academic medical centers who said, if you want to keep what is best about American health care, you will have to fix what doesn't work about it. You will have to find a way to cover all Americans because we are being hurt now. We used to pass our costs on to everybody else, but States are controlling their costs. The Federal Government's controlling their costs. These big companies that used to send their employees to our medical center, they're controlling their costs. And we're left holding the bill for all the poor people we have to care for and all the middle class people with horrible problems that show up without insurance. And please give us universal coverage if you want the medical schools of America to continue to work. Read this.

All I have tried to do, folks, is to consult with everybody from Dr. Koop who was President Reagan's Surgeon General to the heads of our biggest medical schools to the heads of our biggest corporations that can't deal with their medical problems to the small businesses that want to buy insurance who can't to come up with something that works. I have no pride of authorship and no pride of details. I just want to do what will work for people like Jim Bryant and his wife and kids. And I think you do too. If we'll keep that attitude, we'll find a solution in the next 3 months to the problem of health care.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

[At this point, Gov. Carroll Campbell, Jr., of South Carolina opened the floor for questions. Gov. Terry Branstad of Iowa then noted that there was no consensus on employer mandates and asked if a consensus agreement could be reached on reform of the tax system, the medical malpractice system, and the insurance system.]

The President. Let me—I'm glad you asked the question like you did because it gives me a chance to maybe be a little more direct in what I was trying to say before. If you look at the experience of the States, my answer to you is it depends upon whether

in the aggregate, based on the evidence that we have and the best opinion of the medical experts, we increase coverage. And we're moving toward what I think we all want, which is a phased-in deliberate effort to get toward universal.

The evidence is, Governor, that if you do these insurance reforms and you don't do something that you know will increase coverage among working people the impact of the insurance reforms will be to decrease coverage among working people. That is what happened in a number of States in the last 3 years.

We've got 5 million more Americans without insurance coverage now than we had in 1988, and we only have 1.3 million more people living in America. So the rest of them lost their coverage. And most of them were living in States where insurance reforms occurred.

So I will say again, it depends on what else is in there. There may be some way other than an employer mandate to do this. I heard Governor Waihee say that this morning on television. There may be some other way to do this, but the real issue—the test ought to be the test you apply to yourselves. That's the only test I have. Will it do what we say it's going to do? We could pass a bill and all shout hallelujah and get by the November elections. But there will be real consequences to what happens here. And those consequences will be apparent in '95, '96, '97, '98, '99. The answer is, what will happen to the people.

I just think we have to be careful. We have evidence; we know now what happens. A lot of these insurance reforms very much need to be implemented. But if they're not implemented in the right way, they will simply raise the price of insurance for everybody else, causing more single individuals and more marginal small businesses to drop coverage, which will shrink the pool and increase the rates. And the cycle will continue.

I mean, it's almost unbelievable when you look at it that we've gone from 88 percent coverage, backsliding down to 83 percent as a nation. And I will say again, only five States have been able to show in the last 5 years an increase in coverage among the working uninsured. That's no offense to you; I ap-

plaud all of you. I tried to do it, too. I'm not criticizing anybody. I'm just saying at some point we have to look at what the evidence shows. And I don't think we should do something that will not work. But I would not rule out a health bill that didn't have an employer mandate if we knew we were moving toward full coverage and we had some evidence that it would work.

[Gov. Roy Romer of Colorado advocated a phased-in expansion of the employer based system for health care.]

The President. Governor Romer, I'm very much in favor of a phase-in. I don't think anybody—you can't mess with something this big unless you do it over a period of years. And the message I got after meeting with a lot of you and with others and people in the Congress is we ought to lengthen the phase-in a little bit; we agreed to do that.

Let me just say one thing to go back to your question and the question Governor Branstad raised, is, there is some reason to believe that if we—and I'm not for unfunded mandates, but one of the things I think we have to do in this bill is, I think that enrollment in these alliances, purchasing alliances, these buying co-ops should be voluntary, but I think every State should have one. And they don't cost very much; California has only got 11 folks working in theirs, but I think we ought to pay the bill for it. I don't think we should have an unfunded mandate, but I think that every State ought to set some network up.

If you look at what's happened in Florida, for example, where—I wish Governor Chiles were here—they have very restrictive rules on who can get in. I believe you have to be in a business with 50 or fewer employees, and I believe you have to have been without insurance for a year, and they still have very heavy subscription.

In the State of California—I don't think Governor—is Governor Wilson here? In the State of California where they had 2,400 businesses enrolled, which is not an enormous number in a State as big as California, but it's not insignificant, they had 40,000 employees in the pool, and every single one of them got the same or better health insurance for lower premium costs.

So we know that there are certain economies of scale that can be achieved here. The question is, will they be offset by the insurance reforms if you don't also do something to increase the pool of the covered people. That's really what we've got to deal with. As you know, I basically agree with you. I know Governor Lowry—and they wrestled with this in Washington—essentially reached the same conclusion. There are lots of adjustments that can be made: You can make adjustments in the benefit package; you can make adjustments in what's the percentage that the employer and the employee should pay.

But the main thing we have to do is to keep increasing the coverage. If you keep sliding back, you're looking at a system now that's headed toward a financial disaster. And in the end, Government will wind up picking up a bigger and bigger share of the bill, which is just what we don't want to happen, I think.

[Gov. E. Benjamin Nelson of Nebraska thanked the President for his bipartisan comments and requested the maximum amount of flexibility for the States.]

The President. I am very open to that, Governor Nelson. For one thing, if you look at it, some States—we've got a couple of States besides Hawaii that are already at or above 90 percent, where they can imagine themselves reaching, through various mechanisms, 95 percent, 96 percent, 97 percent coverage.

As I said, I think we have moved in Social Security. We were at 97 percent Social Security for many years. I think we're just by improvements in bookkeeping, up to a little above 98 percent now. So we know we're not going to get right at 100 percent, but we know that you've got to get somewhere in the ballpark of 95 percent or upwards so you stop the cost shifting and you have economies of scale for all of the small businesses that are participating.

But there are differences. The economic realities and the demographic realities are so different from State to State, I think you're going to have to have some more flexibility. And I'm quite open on that, to doing some more on that.

[Gov. Brereton Jones of Kentucky discussed the need for universal coverage and an employer mandate and the need for these changes to come from the Federal Government.]

The President. Let me just say—[Applause] thank you—the reason I proposed the shared responsibility requirement is the reason—there were two reasons. One is the one mentioned by Governor Romer. It was the natural outgrowth of what we had, and we knew that we could get studies that would show that it would actually lower average costs of small business. We also knew we could afford to subsidize the smallest businesses and the people that were on the lowest profit margins so they could make it. And we knew that if that happened on a national basis, nobody would be at a competitive disadvantage.

I know that these ads that this other health reform group has been running—I didn't even know about it until they were on the air—involving the fast food operations and not covering their workers in America and covering their workers in Japan and Germany have been somewhat controversial, but they make the point, which is that if all your competitors are in the same boat you're in, you don't go broke doing this. They make that point. And so, I did it for that reason.

The second reason I recommended it, is that we had evidence. We had the evidence of Hawaii; we had the evidence of Germany which has a mixed system and which provides high-quality care at a lower cost even than the Canadian system. So, we had evidence. We had a system that could be expanded, and we had evidence. I have never ruled out another option. I just have never seen one I thought would work. And I do believe we have to keep working toward that.

And as I said, I keep saying there ought to be a middle ground here. And I always enjoy reminding Senator Packwood that he and President Nixon recommended the 50-50 employer-employee split in 1972, and I don't believe that the Republican Party has moved that far from its moorings in the last 22 years. So, I'm asking them to come home a little bit, and I still think we can do it.

Q. Mr. President, I didn't mean to ask a question, but I cannot let Governor Jones'

statement go unanswered. That is not what Senator Dole said. Senator Dole came in, and he indicated a willingness to move. What he said was he didn't think we could get there all at once, and if we couldn't we shouldn't abandon the effort.

The President. I agree with that.

Q. He didn't want you to think he was against "all," and his statement was, "I'm not against coverage for all." He didn't think we could get there, but he didn't think we should abandon the effort if we didn't get 100 percent at once though. And I didn't think it's fair to him to have it depicted that way, and I wanted to correct that, sir.

The President. Let's look at the political context in which we're operating here, the context in the country and the context in the Congress real quickly. I know I have to quit, but you can help to change the context. If you're Democrat, you can help to change it; if you're Republican, you can help to change it if you want us to get together. Let's be fair now to everybody involved, including the leaders of the other party. Let's look at what everybody's up against.

When I put out my plan, the Health Insurance Association didn't like it because the alliances were mandatory which meant that fewer insurance companies would get to compete for health insurance business and because we had premium caps on there, and they didn't want that. They thought it was too regulatory. So, they put Harry and Louise on television. And we didn't have the money to answer that, and so, after the time they've been on television, everybody else has done all their letter-writing campaign and all that stuff had happened, they made something called the Clinton plan unpopular even though the basic elements still have the support of 60 percent or more of the American people when you strip it away. So, that happened.

Ironically, the Health Insurance Association favors the employer requirement. Who doesn't favor that? The NFIB is against it. They have a lot of insurance agents in their membership, and they have small business people who ideologically don't think they should be required to offer insurance. And the conservative wing of the Republican

Party is against it. That's the context in which we meet and bring it to the Congress.

Now, what do we try to do to offset that. First of all, we made some changes in our plans, made it less bureaucratic, more flexible, more open, and responded to you. I explained that. Secondly, we put together a group of small business people, 29 different large groups with 600,000 small businesses to say "we'd be better off if everybody had to pay and our costs would go down. Please do this."

In other words, what we're trying to do is to get back again to where we can have a debate that's not so politically charged. The problem you have, obviously, in the Congress now is—and the problem and the opportunity—is that under the rules of the United States Senate only the budget can be passed without a filibuster. No other bill can pass the Senate not subject to a filibuster. So that means that if 41 Senators decide that bill X shouldn't come to a vote, it can't come to a vote.

So that's why all the Democrats have been saying all along, we've got to have some sort of bipartisan support here. And again I will say, what I would like us to do is to come back to the principle that we must do what we know will work to provide security, to provide control of costs, to maintain choice and quality. And if we just will be guided by that, we will come up with a bill that the American people will be proud to have us sign without regard to their party.

We have been through a long period here of congressional debate and discussion and everything, and the political atmosphere has been charged and gone up and down. There's a lot of unreality out there. There's been a lot of reality around this table today. If we can bring that back to the Congress, we'll get a good bill, if everybody will just forget about all the rhetoric and do something that will work.

But we must not blind ourselves to what these medical school deans said. I mean there was 100 of them that came to see me. They know what they're doing. They know what works. And we have to do something that works. That's my only bottom line. Let's do not mislead the American people. If we're going to act, let's do something that will leave

the people in New Mexico and Utah and Montana better off.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:18 a.m. at the Hynes Convention Center.

Exchange With Reporters in Boston on Health Care

July 19, 1994

Q. Are you now willing to compromise on universal coverage more and on mandates, sir? We're really confused.

The President. Listen, I've always had the olive branch out. I am not willing to do something that doesn't work. Did you all listen to what I said? I said that of the States that have done these modest reforms, only 10 have increased the number of people with insurance. We are losing ground. We must not do something that is a fraud.

I have never said that we had to have the employer mandate, although I think that's the best and fairest way. I do think we have to keep going towards universal coverage. That's what I think we have to do.

Q. But you would accept something less than 100 percent?

The President. Social Security doesn't have 100 percent.

Q. That's the first time we've heard you say that.

The President. Social Security—you cannot physically get 100 percent. There's no way to get 100 percent. Social Security only has 98, and they've just moved from 97 a couple years ago. But I think you have to have a universal coverage goal because if you don't have the idea of trying to essentially have functionally full coverage, whatever that is, it's a very high percentage, then the rest of these reforms will not work.

So my olive branch came because he said he was willing to work every day in August, every day in September, and every day in October, and I liked that.

Q. Maybe he's talking about a filibuster—

The President. All I'm asking you tonight is report this on the merits. Talk about what the doctors said. Talk about what the people said. These doctors, a lot of these doctors

might be Republicans that signed this ad in the Boston Globe today. They said what will work is universal coverage. That is the almost universal opinion of knowledgeable physicians. The people who know what will control costs and provide security to middle class America know that unless you cover virtually everybody, you're not going to get that done.

And let's talk about the merits. Let's not turn this into a political story, let's talk about what will work in middle America.

Q. How about a 50–50 split?

The President. I'm open to changes in the split. I'm open to a lot of things. I just want to cover the American people. I've always been open to that from the first day. The only thing I want to do is get everybody covered, deal with the cost, preserve choice.

Q. [*Inaudible*—fully cover less than 100 percent?

The President. You cannot physically cover 100 percent. It's impossible. Nobody can do that. We don't cover 100 percent of the people in Social Security, and it's universal. Social Security is universal. I want a universal program, but we can't physically get to 100 percent.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 12:30 p.m. at the Hynes Convention Center. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Notice on the Continuation of the Iraqi Emergency *July 19, 1994*

On August 2, 1990, by Executive Order No. 12722, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Iraq. By Executive Orders Nos. 12722 of August 2, 1990, and 12724 of August 9, 1990, President Bush imposed trade sanctions on Iraq and blocked Iraqi government assets. Because the Government of Iraq has continued its activities hostile to United States interests in the Middle East, the national emergency declared on August 2, 1990, and the measures adopted on August 2 and August 9, 1990, to deal with that emer-

gency must continue in effect beyond August 2, 1994. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iraq.

This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 19, 1994.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:08 a.m., July 19, 1994]

NOTE: This notice was published in the *Federal Register* on July 20.

Proclamation 6707—National Apollo Anniversary Observance *July 19, 1994*

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

When John F. Kennedy called upon our Nation to join him in a journey to the unknown frontier of space, Americans eagerly accepted the challenge. Propelled by the fire that President Kennedy sparked in our imaginations, the pioneering scientists of our country's emerging space program sent the Apollo 11 astronauts on the greatest adventure humankind has ever known. As the first extraordinary images of the moon's surface were transmitted to Earth for all to see, we began to recognize, as never before, how far the human race had traveled—and how far we have yet to go.

Today, more than 30 years after President Kennedy's historic vision, America's gaze remains drawn to the heavens. Space exploration has become an integral part of our national character, capturing the spirit of optimism and adventure that has defined this country from its beginnings.

On this 25th anniversary of the historic Apollo mission to the moon, our tradition of bold discovery compels us to embrace the opportunities of the dawning 21st century. Although ours is a very different world than that of the 1960s—one of tightening re-

sources and expanding international competition—our determination to meet the future with courage guides us still.

By advancing a program in robotic exploration using smaller, less costly spacecraft, we can further expand our understanding of the origins of our solar system and of the universe beyond it. By renewing our commitment to human space flight in concert with other nations, we can strengthen the bonds of international friendship, while fostering the technological development that holds the key to long-term economic growth. By investing in space transportation, we will ensure affordable access to space for our posterity. By supporting the communications and navigational systems that have maintained our Nation's security, we help to promote stability around the globe. By completing our "Mission to Planet Earth," we will gain unique insight into our planet's dynamic environment. We have one chance to keep our covenant with the generations to come—safeguarding the thin blue shield that sustains all of Earth's inhabitants.

For when our children see tomorrow's satellite image of our world from space, these are the visions we want them to see—visions of communication and cooperation, visions of permanence and peace. We must empower our young people to venture farther into the limitless frontier of space. We must encourage them to recognize the vast possibilities of science and mathematics, instilling in their generation the same faith in self that enabled explorers of our generation to stand on the soil of another world. Today's children do not, of course, remember the way the world held its breath as Neil Armstrong took his "one small step." But they do see the magic and enjoy the benefits of that journey every day, from the computers they use in schools to the electronic highways that connect them to friends around the world.

As we celebrate this important anniversary, our eyes again turn to the horizon. We look to the future of new technologies that we may better provide for our people. We look to the atmospheres of distant worlds that we may better protect the life's breath of our own fragile planet. We aim toward the farthest reaches of our universe that we may better understand ourselves. These are the

challenges that await us. Today, let us chart a course to meet them.

In recognition of our achievements, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 187, has designated July 16 through July 24, 1994, as "National Apollo Anniversary Observance," and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim July 16 through July 24, 1994, as National Apollo Anniversary Observance to be celebrated with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also call upon the people of the United States to observe this occasion by honoring the Apollo 11 mission and all of the men and women who have served in our Nation's space program.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this nineteenth day of July, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-four, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and nineteenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 10:29 a.m., July 20, 1994]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on July 21.

Memorandum on Assistance to the Caucasus

July 19, 1994

Presidential Determination No. 94-36

Memorandum for the Secretary of Agriculture

Subject: Food Security Wheat Reserve Release

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President by the Food Security Wheat Reserve Act of 1980 (the "Act") (7 U.S.C. 1736f-1), I hereby authorize the release in fiscal year 1994 of up to 200,000 metric tons of wheat from the reserve established under the Act (the "reserve") for use under Title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to meet relief

needs that exist in the Caucasus region of the former Soviet Union, which I hereby determine are suffering severe food shortages. The wheat will be used to provide urgent humanitarian relief to the peoples in this region who are suffering widespread hunger and malnutrition.

This action is taken because wheat needed for relief in this region cannot be programmed for such purpose in a timely manner under the normal means of obtaining commodities for food assistance due to circumstances of unanticipated and exceptional need.

You are authorized and directed to publish this determination in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:57 p.m., July 19, 1994]

NOTE: This memorandum was published in the *Federal Register* on July 21.

**Statement on the Fifth Anniversary
of the Arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi**
July 19, 1994

July 20 marks the 5th anniversary of the detention of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the democratic opposition in Burma and a symbol of human rights and democracy worldwide.

The remarkable resurgence of democracy in so many parts of the world in recent years demonstrates that authentic voices of freedom cannot be stilled and ultimately will triumph. Aung San Suu Kyi reflects the fundamental yearning of the Burmese people for freedom and justice. She honors the memory of her father Aung San, the founder of modern Burma, and continues to embody the hopes of the people of Burma for an end to the military dictatorship and the reestablishment of popular, representative government.

I urge the Burmese military regime to heed the will of its own people by releasing unconditionally Aung San Suu Kyi and all other remaining prisoners of conscience in Burma. I also call on the regime to honor the results of the 1990 election and to undertake genuine democratic reform. To this end,

the regime should begin a substantive dialog with Aung San Suu Kyi aimed at achieving a political settlement that respects the sentiments of the people of Burma.

This issue remains a priority for my administration. For this reason, we welcome any efforts by the international community and by Burma's neighbors to encourage genuine reforms. The United States also looks forward to discussing these vital issues later this month during the ASEAN Post-Ministerial Conference in Bangkok, where we will seek an intensified effort to gain the release of Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners and to promote genuine democratic reform.

**Statement on the Senate Judiciary
Committee Vote on Supreme Court
Nominee Stephen Breyer**
July 19, 1994

I am deeply gratified by the Senate Judiciary Committee's unanimous vote to forward Stephen Breyer's nomination to the full Senate for confirmation to the Supreme Court. Chairman Biden and Senator Hatch deserve enormous credit for their bipartisan spirit and responsible approach to this nomination.

The Judiciary Committee has now given unanimous, bipartisan support to two consecutive Supreme Court nominees. I hope this is a sign not only of the quality of those two selections but also of a return of civility to the confirmation process.

I am confident that the full Senate will act swiftly to confirm Judge Breyer. I believe he will be an intellectual leader on a Court that respects the Constitution. His brilliant mind and balanced approach will make him a superb Supreme Court justice.

**Remarks at a Fundraiser for Texas
Senatorial Candidate Richard Fisher**
July 19, 1994

Thank you very much, Richard, and you and Nancy and your wonderful children. It's a great honor for me to be here tonight even to take a little ribbing by Bob Strauss about how I look in my running shorts. [Laughter] Henry looks better in his running shorts. I

saw Henry in his running shorts yesterday morning in Miami, and I thought he looked better, too. But I wouldn't have said it in public if Bob hadn't. *[Laughter]* I hope Henry's enjoyed his brief tenure as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. *[Laughter]* Akin Gump is going to hire him for about a half million a year starting tomorrow, Bob Strauss' penance. *[Laughter]*

I want to thank Secretary Cisneros for the brilliant job he has done, literally. I mean it's unbelievable what's happened to HUD since he took over, how he's turned it around and made it an instrument of progress: everything from standing up for civil rights of people, the standing up for the civil right of people who live in public housing to be free of crime, what they're doing in Chicago and throughout the country is unbelievable; and now working not only to try to help homeless people get off the street but help them get into the mainstream of life which is, after all, the ultimate answer to the problem of homelessness.

I want to thank Senator Graham, my longtime friend, a former seatmate in the Governors' Association, for his sterling leadership of the Senate Campaign Committee.

And what can I say about Secretary Bentsen—that he hasn't already said? *[Laughter]* I'll tell you one thing, I like to make fun of him because he talks in such a frank way to his President when I need to be frankly spoken to which is about every other day, you know. *[Laughter]* But in the annals of this century when the history is written, I think that he will be literally remembered as one of the greatest Secretaries of the Treasury we ever had and as someone who dealt with a very rapidly changing world with all kinds of new challenges and had a major responsibility in helping this country adjust its economy to the global economy. He has been absolutely spectacular. I had high aspirations for Lloyd Bentsen's tenure, but he exceeded them in every way, and I am very grateful to him for that.

Let me tell you about Richard Fisher and one reason I'm here tonight, besides the fact that I want him to be elected real bad—*[laughter]*—is that we met a few years ago when he and I were involved in the Democratic Leadership Council which might be

subtitled, Don't Lose Control of the Senate This Year, DLC. But we both got in it because we were worried that the Democratic Party was becoming less relevant to the future of America and becoming alienated from the mainstream of America, but we knew what the Republicans were selling was not going to do much for America over the long run.

And one of the real challenges that I think we've had, particularly in Texas, is to get the voters of the State of Texas to listen not only to the rhetoric but to compare the rhetoric politicians use to the reality of their actions. And I think that Richard Fisher is better positioned to do that than any public figure since Lloyd Bentsen in the State of Texas, and I think he's going to do it.

I appreciate what he said about our administration tonight and the fact that he has embraced the Democratic Party but also been willing to challenge it to change, to take unconventional positions to move toward the future, to grow the economy and keep the American dream alive.

And I'll tell you, there are some very specific reasons that I think he ought to be elected. First of all, I'd like to be in a position to do more for Texas. We passed NAFTA here, and it was deadlier than a doornail until we got the environmental agreements, the labor agreements, and it came back from the dead. And we did it because of farsighted business people and others up here working. And then San Antonio and other cities in Texas, Dallas, and El Paso, have benefited from things we've done as a result of NAFTA. But most importantly, our trade is growing faster with Mexico than any other country in the world. We've sold 5 times as many cars in Mexico already this year as we did last year, and that's just the beginning. It was the right thing to do. But we need a bipartisan group of people who will work for the best interest of the country.

The second thing I want to say is we just saved the space station. We saved the space station, which was very important to Texas, which passed by one vote in the House last year. We changed 52 Democrats and 11 Republicans in one year. And we did it by tying the space station to America's future, to our cooperation in space with the Russians, and

to what we need to do together to build a future.

But it is difficult to do—to work when people come up to me all the time and say, “Why are you trying to help Texas? Listen to the way those Senators talk about you. Look how they vote.” And, “What difference will it make in the next election? We need the money to spend on education or training or something else.” And I tell everybody I’m not trying to help Texas, I’m trying to help America. I tried to save the super collider last year. And these House Members will tell you that on the day, at the moment the House of Representatives was voting on the supercollider and the opponents were saying it was a boondoggle for Texas, the Senators from Texas were on the steps of the Capitol with other citizens of the State screaming at the Congress to cut more spending. And so they did. Isn’t that right? At the very moment—their timing was exquisite. And yet I gave them a chance to vote for the biggest deficit reduction package in history. And they both voted no. And they said, “Why, this will bring the economy of America to an end. It’ll be terrible for Texas.”

But by the narrowest of margins, Congress voted for \$255 billion in spending cuts; tax cuts for 15 million working American families; a tax increase for only 1.5 percent of us, including a lot of us in this room—[laughter]—that went to pay down the deficit; a tax break for 90 percent of the small businesses in this country; lower interest rates on college loans for 20 million American students; and a bill that will give us 3 years of deficit reduction for the first time since Harry Truman was President; a bill that reduces the size of the Federal bureaucracy, that the Republicans always scream about, by 250,000, and by 1999, we’ll have the smallest Federal Government that we’ve had since John Kennedy was President—the first time it’s gone below 2 million—100 percent from votes of Democrats.

And what was the result: 3.8 million new jobs; a 1.7 percent in the unemployment rate; the largest number of new business incorporations last year of any year since the end of World War II; and the first quarter of this year, the first quarter in 16 years there was no bank failure. I plead guilty for fighting

for that. It was good for Texas, and I’d like to have some help from people who believed in it.

Now, I’m telling you I have pleaded for bipartisan cooperation in a lot of ways, but they want to go out and use that old tax and spend rhetoric. You just check your hip pocket, folks. It is time. America has got to lead the world into the 21st century. We have difficult challenges ahead. We’ve got a crime bill to pass here. We’ve got welfare reform to pass here. We have to come to grips with health care.

I just got back from a trip to Europe in which I had three large meetings with American service families, enthusiastic Americans serving our country overseas, willing to put their lives on the line for you. And do you know in all three meetings, those people only asked me about one issue, health care. They’re afraid they’re going to be sent home after serving our country abroad to a country in which they won’t have health insurance for their children. They know we spend more on health care than anybody else in the world. We’re the only country in the world that can’t figure out what to do about it.

Now, Hawaii figured out what to do about it. They adopted the solution Secretary Bentsen’s always advocating: let employers and employees split the burden, buy private insurance, cover everybody. In Hawaii insurance costs small business 30 percent less than it does in the rest of the country; everybody’s covered; and people are healthier. We’ve got to do something about this, folks.

I went to the Governors’ conference today and the Republican leader of the Senate was there, and he said he was willing to work all through August, which I took as a significant olive branch, and all through September and all through October. And I am too, all day and all night long. But if we don’t do something about this, what’s going to happen to the Federal Government is we’ll cut defense too much, we won’t be able to invest what we ought in our children’s future and our education and training and building the economy tomorrow. And being in the Senate and House is going to be a matter of writing checks for health care because that’s the only thing that’s going up. Everything else is going

down—and not to buy new health care but just more for the same. We can't do it.

There may be other ideas than mine, but I'll tell you one thing: I hired on to solve problems. And I showed up for Richard Fisher tonight not because he will agree with me on every issue, he will disagree from time to time. He will vote for the people of Texas, not for me. But he will hire on to solve problems. He does not want to come up here and warm the seat or have empty rhetoric or just spout empty rhetoric. Public service should be about ideas and ideals and vision and what's good for ordinary people. That's how this country lasted 218 years.

And I believe he's got a chance to win that is better than average. And more importantly, I think he has that chance because he is right for the people of Texas, and that will be good for the United States of America. And I thank you for helping him.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 7:45 p.m. in the Chinese Room at the Mayflower Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Robert Strauss, former chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks and an Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Congressional Leaders

July 20, 1994

Legislative Agenda

The President. Let me begin by thanking the Democratic leadership for coming today and saying we have a very active several weeks ahead of us in this session of Congress with action pending on health care, on the crime bill, on GATT, with bills pending on campaign finance reform and lobby reform and several other things. We're going to have a lot of work on our hands.

I would like to restate a few things about health care in light of the meeting with the Governors yesterday. First of all, my goal is universal coverage. It is the only goal that works for ordinary Americans. I have always said, from the time I presented my bill, that I was flexible on how to get universal coverage and would be willing to compromise on that. I was encouraged that the Senate Minority Leader said yesterday that he was

willing to work every day in August, September, and October if necessary to get a good health care bill.

But let me make the main point I was trying to make yesterday. Whatever we do must work for ordinary Americans. We now have a lot of evidence that if we tinker around with the system and don't try to do something comprehensive, we could actually make it worse for ordinary Americans. We could increase the cost to middle class Americans and decrease coverage.

I am very encouraged that today the American Medical Association and the AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, joined the AFL-CIO in coming out for universal coverage and shared responsibility between the employers and the employees. That's a very good sign that they have analyzed this in the same way that we have. And I hope it will contribute to the debate. I believe it will. They joined, as you know, the heads of virtually every medical school in America, the Nurses Association and other doctors' associations, thousands of small business people.

So, we have to do something that works. That's going to be my bottom line. Let's don't do something that won't work.

Health Care Reform

Q. Mr. President, the confusion seems to be over how you define universal coverage.

The President. I don't think that's right. The only definitional issues that arose in the Congress were definitional issues that some people around this table were involved in on the so-called trigger mechanism, what level of coverage that you're making progress for universal coverage would trigger further action and what wouldn't. That's something that will be up to the congressional people to work out.

The point I was trying to make yesterday is that we have no way of knowing, we have no evidence that there is any available and affordable way to get close to 100 percent of coverage without some sort of requirement that involves everybody paying. That's the point I was attempting to make yesterday, but I'm willing to listen if somebody's got another idea that will work. We mustn't do something that doesn't work.

We have this Catholic Health Association study which shows conclusively that if you just try to do insurance reforms you could wind up with higher rates for middle class people at lower levels of coverage. That is the essence. But let's do something that works for ordinary Americans.

Q. But 95 percent would still leave millions of Americans uninsured, and don't you have the same problem then if they are uninsured that there will be the cost shifting that you —

The President. No one ever talked about a law. There's never been a suggestion that we have a law which would set that as a goal. That number only came up in the context of the so-called trigger bill. Nobody did that. And no one has yet found a way to do that without a law that says "universal coverage." The point I made yesterday is we have universal social security, but about 2 percent somehow don't get covered. We have universal school attendance laws in every State in the country, but there are always a couple of percent of the people that fall through the cracks. [*Inaudible*—write it into law to get this.

Q. Are you sorry —

The President. No. I'm sorry that after all my skills and efforts at communicating, the point I really made yesterday somehow didn't get through, which is that we now have the evidence of the States and another study which shows that the opposing bills, the alternative bills, will not work. That is the issue. We must do something that works.

Q. Are you considering working through August, September, October?

The Vice President. Why are you interested, Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]? [*Laughter*]

The President. Let me just say this. I'm sure—Senator Dole offered that yesterday, and I would gladly accept. Of course, I'm sure it's not just up to him and to me. But I think it's worth it for the American people to get a good health bill.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:20 a.m. in the Cabinet Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks Prior to Discussions With President-Elect Ernesto Perez Balladares of Panama and an Exchange With Reporters

July 20, 1994

President Clinton. First, I'd like to welcome the President-elect of Panama and congratulate Mr. Perez Balladares on his election and on the successful democratic transition in Panama. I also want to thank him for his interest in the Summit of the Americas and his interest in exercising a leadership role in helping us to work on money laundering, drug trafficking, and a lot of the international criminal problems that we face together. And finally I'd like to thank him for his willingness to help us to establish some safe havens for people who are leaving Haiti. All these things, I think, augur well for his strong leadership not only within Panama but throughout the hemisphere, and I'm looking forward to this meeting.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, Congressman Richardson is saying that General Cédras is not intransigent, that he's realistic, indeed, that he wants to talk; whereas William Gray is saying time for talking is over, there's nothing to talk about except "When are you going to leave?" Who do you agree with, if either of them? And should the U.S. be talking to Cédras?

President Clinton. You have to ask Mr. Gray about that. But the issue is, if he wants to talk about when he's going to leave, then I'm sure that somebody would talk to him. But they have usurped power. They agreed to go in the Governors Island Agreement, Mr. Cédras and the others; they have not gone, and they must go. That's our position.

Q. Is Panama now offering safe havens for Haitian refugees?

President-elect Perez Balladares. Well, as you know, in a democracy there is only one President at a time. We're willing to cooperate because we think it's a hemispheric duty to bring about democracy in Haiti and also because we think it's humanitarian. Therefore yes, we would be inclined after September 1st, when I start my term, to work

some agreement together to bring these two objectives into fruition.

Q. What about the October deadline that Mr. Gray was talking about? Mr. Gray seemed to be indicating that there was a deadline. Is there a——

President Clinton. We don't have a specific deadline. What he said was that he expected that democracy would be returned to Haiti before the end of the year but that our policy has no specific deadline.

[At this point, one group of reporters left the room, and another group entered.]

Panama

President Clinton. Let me say to all of you, I want to welcome the President-elect of Panama here and congratulate Mr. Perez Balladares on his election victory and on the successful transition to democracy and to express my appreciation for his interest in exercising a leadership role at the Summit of the Americas, which will be held at the end of this year in Miami, and particularly his interest in the whole question of doing more in a cooperative way on the problems of money laundering and drug trafficking. I think that there are many things we can do together. I am very encouraged about the possibility of a genuine partnership, and I'm looking forward to our first meeting.

Haiti

Q. Mr. President, the situation in Panama, people are concerned about the Haiti situation, which Panama later on may be getting involved in that. What is the position of the Government in terms of that?

President Clinton. Well, we are, as you know, determined to see that the people who have illegally taken power in Haiti leave there. They agreed to leave last year. They broke their agreement, and we are pushing forward at the United Nations and in consultation with our allies and the friends of democracy throughout the Caribbean and Central America and South America to further that goal. And we'll do what we can to keep pushing it. We have strong sanctions in effect now, and we're going forward.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:09 p.m. in the Oval Office at the White House. In his remarks,

he referred to Raoul Cédras, leader of the Haitian military. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks on the 25th Anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon Landing

July 20, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, veterans of the Apollo program, the friends of the space program in America, and most of all, to those whom we honor here today.

Just a day before he died, President Kennedy compared our space program to a boy who comes upon a wall in an orchard. The wall is tall. It looks insurmountable, but the boy is curious about what lies on the other side. So he throws his cap over the wall, and then he has no choice but to go after it.

Twenty-five years ago today, our Nation, represented by these three brave men, made that climb. And so, today we are gathered to celebrate their voyage and, I honestly hope, to recommit ourselves to their spirit of discovery. *Apollo 11*, Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins were our guides for the wondrous, the unimaginable at that time, the true handiwork of God. They realized the dreams of a nation. They fulfilled an American destiny. They taught us that nothing is impossible if we set our sights high enough.

Today we're honored to have them and all the other Apollo astronauts who are here with us. For every American who followed your journey, especially for those of us who were young on that fateful day 25 years ago, and for the young Americans who still dream dreams of a future in space, we thank you all.

Looking back on that mission, one thing is clear that we ought to remember today. It wasn't easy. The ship to the heavens measured just 13 feet in diameter. The destination was 3 days and a world away. On the third day as the tiny module descended to the Moon, it came dangerously close to a crash landing—that happens around here all the time—*[laughter]*—but Neil Armstrong took over the controls from the computer and landed safely. Man had not been rendered obsolete by the mechanical, and that hasn't

happened yet. Not long after that when he stepped on the Moon, Mr. Armstrong marked the outer limit of the human experiment with those simple words, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind."

These men and the other astronauts who came before and after have helped us to step into another world right here on Earth. They've shown us that we can harness the technology of space in areas from the economy to the environment, to education, to information and technology. The products and knowledge that grew out of our space missions has changed our way of life forever and for the better. And in our quest we have relearned a sense of confidence that has always been an essential ingredient of our American dream. Today, that journey continues. Our commitment to the space program is strong and unwavering. The best way to honor these men and all the others who have helped it so much is to continue that quest.

Many have risked their lives and some have given their lives so that we could go forward. Today I ask that we remember, especially, the crews of *Apollo 1* and the *Challenger*. On this day of celebration we must never forget the deep debt we owe to those brave Americans. And our thoughts should also be with their families and their loved ones, for the sacrifice they have given helped to bring us all to new horizons.

Our space explorations today are important models for cooperation in the new post-cold-war world. The Vice President described that eloquently a moment ago. Sergei's mission was an important first step toward full Russian partnership in what must be our next great mission, the international space station. This permanent orbiting space laboratory, to be built with help from 14 nations, will hasten discoveries in fields from the environment to medicine, to computers. We should also remember that the space station holds great promise for us here at home, as it strengthens our largest export sector, aerospace technology.

All these reasons explain why the House has fully funded already the space station. I want to thank many people who are responsible for that bipartisan victory, but let me mention especially George Brown, Lou Stokes, Bob Walker, and Jerry Lewis. I know

the Vice President and Dan Goldin and a lot of other people burned up the phone lines before the House vote.

Let me say that we've fought a lot of battles for the future around here in the last 18 months, and sometimes it seems that the most important ones are decided by the narrowest of margins. The economic plan passed by a vote. The assault weapons ban passed by two votes. Last year the space station survived by the vote of a single Member of the House of Representatives who changed his mind on the way down the aisle. But this year, thanks to the common endeavors of all of us and thanks to the promise of cooperation with Russia and with other nations, the House of Representatives voted to fund the space station by 122 votes, a bipartisan commitment to America's future.

I thank the Members of the Senate who are here today who are pushing for passage. I know they won't miss this great opportunity which is coming on them very soon. I thank you, Senator Mikulski, and all the other Members of the Senate who are here, for the work that will be done in the Senate.

As we work toward building a better world, we also have to preserve the one we've got here. William Anders of the *Apollo 8* was the first to see the entire Earth at a glance. He said it looked like a fragile "little Christmas tree ornament against an infinite backdrop of space, the only color in the whole universe we could see. It seemed so very finite." Well, because we are so very finite, our responsibility to our planet must not be limited. That's why NASA's Mission to Planet Earth is also a very important part of our future in space. We have to continue to monitor the global environment from space and to act on what we learn.

Above all, let us never forget that all this work is about renewing our hopes and the hopes of generations to come, about the ability of Americans and the ability of human beings everywhere to conquer the seemingly impossible. I don't think anybody can look at the faces of these young people here with us today, and we ought to take a little while and look at them and welcome them here, without seeing again in their eyes dreams that those of us who are older could not have dreamed. The explorations we continue in

space are clear evidence to them that they will grow up in exciting times without limits; times that demand their imagination, their vision, their courage; times that will reward them, too, for believing in themselves and their possibilities.

One of our Young Astronauts, 13-year-old Wayne Gusman from New Orleans, sees a future where being an astronaut will be like, and I quote, "driving a car; everyone will do it." That's a great dream. But that and our other dreams are clearly the natural extensions of the space program which began a generation ago, the direct descendants of the dreams of the three men we are here to honor today. We can get there.

No one who was alive then will ever forget where they were as Michael Collins traveled his solitary vigil around the Moon and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin landed that tiny craft on the surface. The world was captivated not only by the risk and the daring, although they were risking and daring, they were captivated because the landing meant again that the human experiment in conquering new and uncharted worlds was reborn. In that sense it was not an end but a beginning.

So to you gentlemen, we say: For your valor, your courage, your pioneering spirit, and for being here today to remind us again that all things are possible, we are deeply in your debt.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:50 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Sergei Krikalev, Russian cosmonaut who flew aboard the space shuttle *Discovery* in February.

Remarks to the American Legion Girls Nation

July 21, 1994

Thank you very much. I want to welcome the delegates from Girls Nation and all the staff here. I would like to begin by congratulating Molly Spearman on being named the National Girls Nation director this year. She is a State representative from South Carolina, I understand, so that's a very good thing to do. [Laughter] I would also like to congratu-

late the president and vice president of Girls Nation, Laura Fernandez and Amanda Plumb.

Thirty-one years ago I came to the White House for the first time as a delegate to Boys Nation. It was part of a memorable week I will never forget. We met President Kennedy here. We got to see a number of members of the Cabinet. There was an eager anticipation in 1963 of the Presidential election that most people assumed would occur in the next year. And I think it's fair to say that most of us who went home from that experience were inspired in one way or another to pursue a career in public service, more than they ever had been before. And I have seen that happen year in and year out to young boys and young girls who come through the American Legion Boys State and Girls State programs to Girls Nation and to Boys Nation.

The Secretary of State of Wyoming, Kathy Karpan, now a candidate for Governor out there, is an alumni of this program. There will be more and more opportunities in national politics for young women in the years ahead. We now have seven women in the President's Cabinet, more than twice as many women as have ever served in the Cabinet of a President at one time, and have appointed a record number of women Federal judges and other women to important positions. By the time you're old enough to be standing here there will probably be a woman standing up here as President saying, "Well, I've done a pretty good job appointing men to my cabinet. [Laughter] I'm up to five and looking for some more qualified people to serve."

But as you go through life, whatever you do, I hope you'll always be involved in public service. And always remember that as an American citizen in the world's oldest and most successful continuous democracy, there's always an obligation to be involved in fighting for the future. And the only way to preserve the greatest traditions and values of this country is to make sure that we get to that future.

I have done my best here to make this bewildering time of change seem more friendly to the American people and, at the same time, to help us together to rebuild many of our traditional institutions that are

under fire today, our families, our communities, the very institution of work which is at the heart of the American dream.

Our economic plan has succeeded in reducing the deficit by more than at any time in history. Within 5 years we'll have a Federal Government that will be below 2 million for the first time since John Kennedy was President and I came here, the smallest Federal establishment in over 30 years. And when the Congress passes this year's budget, the two together will give us 3 years of deficit reduction in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was the President of the United States almost 50 years ago.

The Congress is about to pass a major crime bill that will put another 100,000 police officers on our streets, ban assault weapons, protect hunting weapons, make it illegal for minors to own handguns or to possess them except in the presence of a qualified supervising adult, provide billions of dollars for programs for young people to stay out of trouble as well as tougher punishment once they get in trouble.

We are looking at a welfare reform program that will literally change the institution of welfare as we know it and support parenting, strengthen the family, and strengthen work. And of course, our most highly publicized struggle today is to try to figure out how to join the ranks of all other advanced nations and finally provide health security to all of our families. Only the United States of all the advanced economies of the world has failed to do that. Now one in six Americans has no health insurance, and the majority of the American people are at risk of losing it at one time or another in their lives.

But the main point I want to make to you who are delegates here is that, as important as all these things are, public service here in Washington is only one way to serve your country. And the things that people do back home every day in the aggregate are still more important. A lot of what we're doing here is designed to empower people in all of your communities and States to do more for themselves. We're about to name communities that are part of a 700-community contest in America to get empowerment zones for their poor areas, so that private enterprise can go in and offer people a chance

to get jobs and have a better future. This crime bill, the most important thing is it will add 20 percent to the size of local police forces in America, so they can prevent crime as well as catch criminals. And I could go on and on and on. The things that happen at the grassroots level are the most important.

So I would like to close by just saying I hope you will remember, as I know all of you have, that what you are doing now is a form of public service. What the staff does in supporting this program is a form of public service. And I think over the long run perhaps the most important initiative that our administration has succeeded in putting through is the national service program, which gives thousands of young people a chance to earn money against their further education by simply serving their communities at the grassroots level.

This summer we'll have 7,000 young Americans in our Summer of Safety working on crime-related issues. This fall we'll have 20,000 young Americans working in communities all over America solving problems and earning credit against their college education. Year after next, if the Congress will keep supporting me, we'll have 100,000 young Americans working to make America a better place at the grassroots level. And all those young Americans together can do more to bring our country together and move our country forward than many people who serve in elected public office.

Let me just say one last point. One of the lessons of this time is that there is no longer an easy dividing line between what we do here at home and what happens around the world, between domestic and foreign policy. In the last year we've had more expansion of trade opportunities than at any previous time period like this in a generation because we know we can't grow our economy at home unless we can grow abroad.

We also are affected by the human rights and political and humanitarian events around the world. And I know all of you have been very moved by the terrible travesty of over one million refugees teeming out of Rwanda, being packed into a very small area. I want to say just a word about that because we have

some Americans who are there with other citizens of the world trying to serve and trying to make a difference.

Just before I came over here today, I had a briefing from the Administrator of our Agency for International Development, our AID program, Brian Atwood. We have already provided over \$120 million to help the refugees, and we are conducting airlifts there as well, flying in needed supplies. But we are very concerned about the new health care problems that are presented by all the refugees that are there. There are a growing number that are dying of cholera and many, many more who are at risk of that. So we are going to participate, indeed, in trying to lead the United Nations in responding to the cholera problem and in dealing with the other aspects of this human catastrophe. And I have asked the National Security Adviser and Mr. Atwood and the Pentagon to implement quickly a practical plan of action that can make a difference on the ground in these camps in Zaire. And I will be talking more about it in greater detail tomorrow, but I did want to say something about it because that's an important part of what it means to be an American as we move toward the 21st century as well.

Let me just say one thing in closing. There is a lot of speculation today about what the character and attitude of young Americans are. There was a cover of one of our major news magazines not very long ago showing a lot of young people and speculating about this so-called Generation X, the people who are just a little older than you, in their twenties. Well, I've got some of those Generation X folks who work here, who have worked here, and I spend a lot of time with young people. And I do not find the cynicism, the pessimism that I keep reading about.

What I find are young people who believe in this country, who believe in themselves, and who believe in the future. And I guess what I would say is, after more than 30 years, since the time I was here and the time you're here, if you ask me to summarize what I have learned, it might be an embarrassing short list. But I can say this: You cannot build a future unless you believe in it and unless you believe in yourselves. And if you do believe

in yourselves and you believe in this country and you believe in your future, you can do anything you wish to do. And I wish you well in doing it.

Thank you very much, and I'd like to ask Molly to come up now. Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:11 p.m. in the East Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Statement on the National Security Strategy Report

July 21, 1994

Today I signed and forwarded to Congress the National Security Strategy Report for 1994, as required by Section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1986. The report outlines the national security strategy of engagement and enlargement my administration has developed to meet the challenges and opportunities of the new era.

Protecting our Nation's security—our people, our territory, and our way of life—is my administration's foremost mission and constitutional duty. The central security challenge of the past half century, the threat of communist expansion, is gone. The dangers we face today are more diverse. At the same time, we have unparalleled opportunities to make our Nation safer and more prosperous. Never has American leadership been more essential.

The new national security strategy elaborated in this report charts a course for American leadership that has already begun to produce tangible results with respect to our security requirements, as shown on the attached fact sheet. Our foreign policy rests on 3 pillars:

- Security.* Our security depends upon our willingness to play a leadership role in world affairs, but we cannot sustain our leadership role without maintaining a defense capability strong enough to underwrite our commitments credibly.
- Economics.* For America to be strong abroad it must be strong economically at home; at the same time, domestic economic renewal depends on the

growth and integration of the global economy.

—*Democracy.* The best way to advance America's interests worldwide is to enlarge the community of democracies and free markets throughout the world.

These goals are mutually supportive. Democratic states are less likely to threaten our interests and more likely to cooperate with us to meet security threats and promote sustainable development. Secure nations are more likely to maintain democratic structures and to support free trade. And even with the cold war over, our Nation's security depends upon the maintenance of military forces that are sufficient to deter diverse threats and, when necessary, fight and win against our adversaries. While many factors ultimately contribute to our Nation's safety and well-being, no single component is more important than the men and women who bear America's uniform and stand sentry over our security.

Our national security requires the patient application of American will and resources. We can only sustain that necessary investment with the broad, bipartisan support of the American people and their representatives in Congress. The cold war may be over, but the need for American leadership abroad remains as strong as ever. I am committed to building a new public consensus to sustain our active engagement abroad. This document is part of that commitment.

NOTE: Attached to the statement was a fact sheet and the National Security Strategy Report for 1994.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the National Security Strategy Report

July 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, I am transmitting a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 21, 1994.

Message to the Congress on Trade With Bulgaria

July 21, 1994

To the Congress of the United States:

On June 3, 1993, I determined and reported to the Congress that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This determination allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status and certain United States Government financial programs for Bulgaria without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic of Bulgaria. You will find that the report indicates continued Bulgarian compliance with U.S. and international standards in areas of emigration and human rights policy.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
July 21, 1994.

Remarks Announcing Assistance to Rwandan Refugees and an Exchange With Reporters

July 22, 1994

The President. Good morning. I have just met with my national security team, and I want to tell you about the new steps I have ordered to respond to the situation in the border regions near Rwanda.

The flow of refugees across Rwanda's borders has now created what could be the world's worst humanitarian crisis in a generation. It is a disaster borne of brutal violence, and according to experts now on site, it is now claiming one life every minute.

Today I am announcing an immediate and massive increase in our response. These efforts will be directed from the White House through my National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, working with Deputy Secretary of Defense Deutch, AID Administrator Atwood, and General Shalikashvili, and Brigadier General John Nix of our European Command will command a joint task force to head our efforts on the ground.

From the beginning of this tragedy, the United States has been in the forefront of the international community's response. As the crisis has gotten worse, our response has also grown.

In May, when the first wave of Rwandan refugees fled to Tanzania, I ordered the release of \$15 million in aid. These monies helped to prevent the kind of problems in Tanzania we are now seeing in Zaire. Since that time, we have authorized an additional \$135 million in relief in the area. Beginning in May, I ordered an airlift of relief supplies. Since then, we have flown over 100 missions.

On May 10th, the Vice President met with the United Nations Secretary-General and the head of the Organization of African Unity in an effort to expand the U.N. peacekeeping force in Rwanda. The following week, the Security Council approved a resolution authorizing that expansion. Then I ordered the Department of Defense to provide equipment, including 50 armored personnel carriers to aid the peacekeepers.

Throughout June and July, I ordered increases in our relief efforts as the crisis escalated. I sent senior administration officials to the region, including Brian Atwood, the Administrator of AID.

Today, I have ordered an immediate massive increase in our efforts in the region in support of an appeal from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. I've ordered the Defense Department to establish and manage an airlift hub in Uganda, which will be used as a staging area for around-the-clock operations for shipments of relief supplies to the refugees in the Rwandan border regions. Consultations are underway now with the Government of Uganda.

I have directed the Defense Department to assist in expanding airlift operations near the refugee camps in Goma and Bukavu. We will provide personnel and equipment to enable these airfields to operate on a 24-hour basis. I've ordered our military to increase the capacity to receive, transfer, and distribute goods at these airfields. Our aim is to move food, medicine, and other supplies to those in need as quickly as possible.

I've directed the Pentagon to establish a safe water supply and to distribute as much water as possible to those at risk. Safe water

is essential to stop the outbreak of cholera and other diseases that threaten the refugees.

Today and tomorrow, about 20 million oral rehydration therapy packages will be delivered, packages that were purchased through AID and delivered on U.S. military aircraft to the refugees in order to try to stem the cholera outbreak.

Our task in Rwanda is twofold: First, to alleviate the suffering as quickly as possible; second, to take steps to establish conditions that will enable the refugees to return home. To achieve the second objective, I have ordered the State Department and our Ambassador to the United Nations, who is here with us today, to take immediate action to help create those conditions. The United States will support and urge the immediate deployment of a full contingent of United Nations peacekeepers to Rwanda to provide security for the return of the refugees.

We are making clear to the new leaders of Rwanda that international acceptance, including American recognition, depends upon the establishment of a broadbased government, the rule of law, and efforts at national reconciliation. We're taking action to counteract the propaganda of the extremist Hutu elements who continue to urge Rwandans to flee. Taken together, these steps will help to relieve the suffering of the Rwandan refugees and create conditions for their return home.

As I said yesterday, we face here a growing human catastrophe. The United States not only supports the efforts of the international community, but is and will continue to take a leading role in those efforts. In the days to come as Americans see this heartbreaking unfolding tragedy, the suffering must not only touch our hearts, it must move Americans all across our Nation to reach out with their own private contribution to relief organizations. And it must move us as a Nation to take the practical actions that this crisis demands.

Q. Mr. President, how much will all of this cost? And how many U.S. troops will be engaged in this operation?

The President. Well, I'd like to leave the details on that question to those who will brief you. It will be in excess of \$100 million.

We'll have modest commitments of American manpower, but enough to do the job.

Health Care Reform

Q. The leadership came here last night and told you that your health care plan for all intents and purposes is dead and that they are going to start over with something very different from what you had proposed. How do you feel about that? Are you willing to accept this turn of events?

The President. First of all, I want to tell you—I had a prediction last night. I said to the leadership—they said, “What should we say?” I said, “Well, I have been saying for 4 weeks we have agreed to dramatically change this plan. We're going to string it out. We have to have a longer phase-in. We have to have less bureaucracy. We have to have totally voluntary small business alliances, and we have to give a bigger break to small businesses to get them to buy into it. I'll bet if you go out there and say it, it will be treated as news.” And that is exactly what happened. That is exactly what I said to the Governors. That is exactly what I've been saying for the last 3 or 4 weeks.

And I'm glad that it finally is going out to the American people. We listened to the American people, all of us did. So we said—when I sent my plan to the Congress, I implored the Congress to go out and offer suggestions for changing it, for improving it, for making it better. I did that from day one. I am still waiting for someone else to produce a bill who believes there's another way to achieve universal coverage.

I thought it was a very good meeting because the leaders reaffirmed their belief that our objectives should stay the same: universal coverage, so that we can provide security to those who have health insurance and cover those who don't. Now, one-sixth of our people—remember, America is going in the wrong direction. Only the United States is reducing the number of people with health coverage every year. Secondly——

Q. But are you going to accept anything——

The President. Secondly, our goals are the same. We reaffirmed them; the leaders reaffirmed them: universal coverage, quality and choice, an emphasis on preventative and primary care, and discipline in constraining costs, not only for the Government so that we don't increase the deficit but also for people in their private insurance plans. And we will have a bill in the Senate and a bill in the House that will achieve those objectives.

The burden is then on others. Finally, the burden must go to others. I would remind you now we have the American Medical Association, several other physicians groups, the Nurses Association, the nonprofit hospital association, virtually every medical center in the country, a huge group of small businesses, a huge group of large businesses, and a wide array of others who support these four goals. The bill that we will come out with, I am confident, will reach these four goals. How we reach them is now up to the Congress working with the White House. But the burden is on those who think they have a better idea to come forward with it.

Someday we are going to have to focus on those who have other alternatives. That is my objective. I think we will reach those four goals. I thought it was a great meeting, and my prediction was that if they would go out and say what I've been saying for a month that it would make news. And sure enough, it did. And I feel very, very good about it.

Now I have to turn this over to them to answer more questions about Rwanda.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:50 a.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Boutros Boutros-Ghali, United Nations Secretary-General; Salim Salim, Secretary General, Organization of African Unity; and Sadako Ogata, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

July 15¹

The White House announced the Clinton administration approved an additional \$17 million for flood recovery for Georgia, Alabama, and Florida.

July 17

In the evening, the President traveled to Miami, FL.

July 18

In the morning, the President attended the first meeting of the executive committee of the Summit of the Americas at the Sheraton Bal Harbour Hotel. He then went to the Miami Beach Convention Center where he attended an afternoon reception with officers of the National Council of La Raza. He traveled to Brunswick, ME, later in the afternoon.

In the evening, the President attended the Maine Democratic Party Coordinated Campaign reception at the Sonesta Hotel. Following the Maine Democratic Party Coordinated Campaign dinner at the Holiday Inn by the Bay, he traveled to Boston, MA.

July 19

In the morning, the President met with Jim and Mary Bryant and their two children, a family from Beverly, MA, who are unable to obtain health insurance under the present system. He returned to Washington, DC, in the afternoon.

In the evening, the President attended a fundraiser for Colorado Gov. Roy Romer at the Sheraton Carlton Hotel.

July 20

The President announced his intention to nominate James W. Swilhart, Jr., to be Ambassador to Lithuania.

July 21

The President announced he has named Senator David Pryor of Arkansas to be Chair-

man of the Policy Committee for the White House Conference on Aging and the following individuals to be members:

- Secretary of Housing and Urban Development Henry G. Cisneros;
- Secretary of Veterans Affairs Jesse Brown;
- Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala;
- Norman Abramowitz;
- Horace Deets;
- James T. Delacruz;
- Rose Dobrof;
- Mary Rose Oakar;
- Herb Sanderson;
- Lawrence Smedley;
- Marta Sotomayor;
- Daniel Thursz.

The President announced that Glenn H. Hutchins will be the Chairman of the Western New Independent States Enterprise Fund.

July 22

The President announced his intention to appoint Peter Berle, Dan Morales, Jean Richardson, John Wirth, and Jonathan Plaut to be members of the Joint Public Advisory Committee of the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation.

The President announced his intention to nominate Dr. Paul Hill to be the Chairperson and Chief Executive Officer of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board and his intention to nominate Dr. Devra Lee Davis, Dr. Gerald V. Poje, Dr. Andrea Kidd Taylor to be members of the Board.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted July 20

Jan Lodol, of Virginia, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, vice Walter Becker Slocombe.

¹ This announcement was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

Walter Becker Slocombe,
of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, vice Frank G. Wisner.

Submitted July 21

Jose M. Amador,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Duane Acker, resigned.

William A. Nitze,
of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, vice Timothy B. Atkeson.

Roger C. Viadero,
of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Agriculture, vice Leon Snead, resigned.

Bill Anoatubby,
of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation for a term of 6 years (new position).

Terrence L. Bracy,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation for a term of 4 years (new position).

Matt James,
of California, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation for a term of 6 years (new position).

Norma Udall,
of Virginia, to be a member of the Board of Trustees of the Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation for a term of 6 years (new position).

Submitted July 22

Frederic Block,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, vice Eugene H. Nickerson, retired.

John Gleeson,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, vice Jack B. Weinstein, retired.

Allyne R. Ross,
of New York, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, vice I. Leo Glasser, retired.

Paul L. Hill, Jr.,
of West Virginia, to be a member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of 5 years (new position).

Paul L. Hill, Jr.,
of West Virginia, to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of 5 years (new position).

Edward Joseph Kelly, Jr.,
of New York, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of New York for the term of 4 years, vice Francis K. Peo.

Robert Moore,
of Illinois, to be U.S. Marshal for the Central District of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice James L. Fyke.

Joseph Nye,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Graham T. Allison, Jr.

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released July 16

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing that Administrator Brian Atwood, U.S. Agency for International Development, will travel to Rwanda and assess relief efforts

Released July 18

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing \$19 million in emergency relief funds for Rwanda

Released July 19

Statement by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on guaranteed health care for every American

Released July 20

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen on the study of people without health insurance

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's meeting with President-elect Ernesto Perez Balladares of Panama

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers on the President's invitation to President Levon Ter-Petrosyan of Armenia for a working visit on August 9

Memorandum by Deputy Counsel to the President Joel Klein on the document request by the Office of Independent Counsel

Released July 21

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Letter from Special Counsel to the President Lloyd Cutler to Senators Riegle and D'Amato

Statement by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers announcing nine Presidential Medal of Freedom award winners

Transcript of a press briefing by Agency for International Development Administrator Brian Atwood on Rwandan refugees

Fact sheet on the national security strategy

Nomination for U.S. Marshal for the District of Wyoming

Released July 22

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Tony Lake, AID Administrator Brian Atwood, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John Shalikashvili, and Acting Secretary of Defense John Deutch

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved July 20

S.J. Res. 187 / Public Law 103-278
Designating July 16 through July 24, 1994, as "National Apollo Anniversary Observance"

Approved July 21

H.R. 3567 / Public Law 103-279
John F. Kennedy Center Act Amendments of 1994

Approved July 22

S. 273 / Public Law 103-280
To remove certain restrictions from a parcel of land owned by the city of North Charleston, South Carolina, in order to permit a land exchange, and for other purposes

S. 1402 / Public Law 103-281
Twin Falls County Landfill Act of 1994

H.R. 4322 / Public Law 103-282
To amend the Small Business Act to increase the authorization for the development company program, and for other purposes

H.R. 4454 / Public Law 103-283
Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1995